

# Trends in Buddhist Studies Amongst Western Scholars

1980-1999

Vol. 7

Compiled by Michael S. Drummond

NW FL/5

824 7.0

tataḥ *adbhir ekā* saptānāṃ tejaḥsamvartanīnāṃ anantaram  
adbhiḥ samvartanī bhavati. *evaṃ gate 'dbhiḥ saptake punaḥ,*  
*tejasā saptakah* etena krameṇāpsamvartanīnāṃ gate saptake  
punaḥ tejaḥsamvartanīnāṃ saptako bhavati. *paścād vāyu-*  
*samvartanī tataḥ* paścād ekā vāyusamvartanī bhavati. ...  
ṣaṭpañcāśat tejaḥsamvartanyaḥ saptāpsamvartanyaḥ ekā  
vāyusamvartanī. *evaṃ ca prajñaptibhāṣyaṃ sunītaṃ bhavati*  
*catuḥṣaṣṭi kalpāḥ śubhakṛtsnānāṃ devānāṃ āyuhpramāṇam*  
*iti.*

Nandāpurī

Peter Skilling

## Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters in the Pāli Nikāyas

This article concerns what the Pāli Nikāyas have to say about the *antarāparinibbāyin* non-returners and their desire for existence and the life in an intermediate existence.<sup>1</sup> I shall argue that this material casts doubt on a major point of Theravāda orthodoxy.

The following are the four noble persons presented in Pali Buddhism:

1. The stream-enterer (*sotāpanno*)
2. The once-returner (*sakadāgāmī*)
3. The non-returner (*anāgāmī*)
4. The arahant (*araham*) (S V 200).

The Buddha stated that it was only in his teaching that one could find these four noble persons.<sup>2</sup> The meanings of

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to Professor Richard F. Gombrich (University of Oxford) for his suggestions which helped me to improve the content of this article. I also appreciate the help given by Professor George D. Bond and the late Professor Edmund F. Perry (Northwestern University) in articulating my initial thoughts into an article.

<sup>2</sup>It is not difficult to understand why Buddhist teaching was so appealing to many sorts of people. It seems Buddhism's diverse ways of presenting many noble stages and persons could embrace a variety of spiritual needs and levels of spiritual development. Buddhism could introduce arahantship here and now for those who came to it seeking no more rebirths. It could offer the stage of non-return for those who came with the aspiration to have an experience in a higher world before attaining the final goal. It could offer the stage of once-return for those who would like to come back to this world one more time to have more experiences as humans before attaining the supreme goal. Finally, it could offer the stage of stream-entry for those who are not really tired of either world but would like to have an assurance of attaining the supreme goal one day. This is also evident from the fact that all the arahants that we find in the Nikāyas are either monks or nuns. There is no reference to living lay

the Pāli names given to identify these four — one who has entered the stream, one who returns once, one who never returns, and the worthy one — also highlight that their spiritual statuses form a hierarchy on a gradual path.<sup>1</sup> They are explained as having achieved these statuses by gradually giving up “ten fetters” (*dasa-saṃyojana*). This hierarchical order is also referred to by naming them the first recluse (stream-enterer), the second recluse (once-returner), the third recluse (non-returner), and the fourth recluse (arahant) respectively (A II 238). Of the four, the arahant is the highest as he is the only fully perfected one, requiring no further instruction (*asekha*); he has achieved the supreme goal, *nibbāna*.<sup>2</sup> The rest are still seekers, requiring instruction (*sekha*), who are advancing towards their final goal.

These four categories of noble person are expanded in the Pāli texts in many different ways. One common expansion can be seen in the following list, where each category is divided into two stages: the path and the fruition.<sup>3</sup>

- 1a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of stream-entry (*sotāpattiphalasacchikiriyāya paṭipanno*)
- 1b. The stream-enterer
- 2a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of once-returning (*sakadāgāmi-phala-sacchikiriyāya paṭipanno*)

arahants. The envisaged spiritual stages for the laity seem to be either stream-entry, once-return, or non-return.

<sup>1</sup>These spiritual stages, as described in S V 25–26, are the fruitions of living a mendicant life (*sāmaññaphalāni*), a holy life (*brahmaññaphalāni*), and a holy practice (*brahmacariyaphalāni*).

<sup>2</sup>There are two other perfected ones besides these four noble persons: the Paṅcakaṇṭhaka and the Sammāsambuddha.

<sup>3</sup>See S V 202; Ud 56; A IV 373.

- 2b. The once-returner
- 3a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of non-returning (*anāgāmi-phalasacchikiriyāya paṭipanno*)
- 3b. The non-returner
- 4a. The one who is in the process of realizing the fruition of arahantship (*arahattaphalasacchikiriyāya paṭipanno*)
- 4b. The arahant

In addition to this there are many other lists, and they demonstrate the multiplication of noble persons according to slight differences in attainments. Even though in many ways these other lists are expansions of the one above, an investigation into them will not only enlarge our understanding of Buddhist soteriology proper but also demonstrate the difficulty in understanding them in terms of the traditional list of ten fetters. The category of non-returners is a case in point. In the Pāli Nikāyas this noble person is expounded in various ways. The following ten non-returners can be named as an example:

1. The first *antarāparinibbāyin*
2. The second *antarāparinibbāyin*
3. The third *antarāparinibbāyin*
4. The *upahaccaparinibbāyin*
5. The *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
6. The *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
7. The *uddhamṣota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*
8. The *kāyasakkhin*
9. The *diṭṭhippatta*
10. The *saddhāvimutta*.

In this study, my main aim is to consider the non-returner type called *antarā-parinibbāyins* and the fetters of existence with which they are said still to be tied. By doing so, I will show how problematic it is to understand the various types of non-returners taking the traditional list of ten fetters as a

basis. I will point out not only the weakness of the traditional list but also why it does not include the “desire for existence”, a fetter that can be found in some other lists and which is essential in describing some of the Buddhist noble persons. A possible reason for its non-inclusion seems to be the Theravāda refusal to accept an intermediate existence. My examination of the *antarāparinibbāyins* and the fetter of existence leads me to conclude that, in spite of the Theravāda refusal, some Pāli texts assume the existence of an intermediate state for the *antarāparinibbāyins*, for they cannot be born again.

## I

Both Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources show that the idea of a non-returner was a commonly understood concept in the Indian religious world at the time of the Buddha. The Buddhist definition of a non-returner in the Nikāyas, according to the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, is that a non-returner (*anāgāmin*) is “a person who does not return (to this world), i.e. who has attained the third stage of sanctification and only is born again in the *Brahma* world before his entrance into *Nibbāna*.”<sup>1</sup> This means that, after his death, he will not come to the sensual realm to be born again (D III 237). The prototype of this very idea of not returning to this world is found in the following passage of the *Bṛhad-āranyaka-upaniṣad*:

Where one’s mind is attached, the subtle self goes thereto with action, being attached to it alone. Obtaining the end of his action, whatever he does in this world he comes again from that world, to this world of action. This [is for] the man who desires. But the man who does not desire, he who is without desire, who is freed from desire, whose

<sup>1</sup> Vin III 87, Vin II 161, Ud 56: *anāvattidhammo tasmā lokā*.

*Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters* 125  
desire is satisfied, whose desire is the Soul; his breaths do not depart. Being Brahman he goes to Brahman.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, when these concepts of returner and non-returner came to Buddhism, they took on new interpretations. The Buddhist categorization of noble persons into returner (*āgāmī*), non-returner (*anāgāmī*), and arahant that we find at Itivuttaka 96 is a good example to illustrate this. The returner, as explained there, is tied with the bonds of sensual pleasure and existence; the non-returner, on the other hand, is free from the bond of sensual pleasure, but has the bond of existence; the arahant is free from both bonds.<sup>2</sup> The word *yoga* or bond in that text is equivalent to the word *saṃyojana* or fetter found elsewhere.

The traditional list of ten fetters is often divided into two sections. Thus, *orambhāgiya-saṃyojana* (“the lower fetters”) and *uddhambhāgiya-saṃyojana* (“the higher fetters”) make up the list of ten. The following five form the group of lower-fetters:

1. personality belief,
2. sceptical doubts,
3. attachment to rules and rituals,
4. sensual desire,

<sup>1</sup> Bṛhad. IV.4.6: *tad eva saktah saha karmaṇaiti liṅgam mano yatra niṣaktam asya; prāpyāntaṃ karmaṇas tasya yat kiṃ ceḥa karoty ayaṃ. tasmāi lokāt punar aiti asmai lokāya karmaṇe, iti nu kāmāyamaṇah; athākāmāyamaṇah, yo 'kāmo niṣkāma āpta-kāma ātma-kāmaḥ, na tasya prāṇā utkrāmanti, na tasya prāṇā utkrāmanti, brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti* (translation from R.E. Hume (*The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*, London: Oxford University Press, 1931, p. 141) and S. Radhakrishnan (*The Principal Upanishads*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1953, pp. 272-73).

<sup>2</sup> It 96: *kāmayogayutto bhikkhave bhavayogayutto āgāmī hoti āgantā itthattaṃ; kāmayogavisaññutto bhikkhave bhavayogayutto anāgāmī hoti anāgantā itthattaṃ; kāmayogavisaññutto bhikkhave bhavayogavisaññutto arahā hoti khīṇāsavo ti.*

5. ill-will (S V 60).

The five that form the higher fetters consist of:

6. desire for form,
7. desire for the formless,
8. pride,
9. restlessness,
10. ignorance (S V 61, D III 234).

The Pāli word *orambhāgiya* means “connected with the lower [worlds]”, and the word *uddhambhāgiya* means “connected with the upper [worlds]”.<sup>1</sup> The first five of the ten fetters are called lower fetters because they tie the individual to the lower realms, also known as the sensual realms. The other five are called higher fetters because they tie the individual to the higher realms which consists of the realms of both form and the formless. By getting rid of the five lower fetters, one becomes free from the sensual realm only, and by getting rid of the five higher fetters, one becomes free from both form and formless realms.

In the Theravāda tradition, this concept of fetters is taken for granted and it is assumed that it is possible to understand the Buddhist noble persons entirely in terms of their giving up of fetters (see, for example, under *saṃyojana* in Nyana-tiloka's *Buddhist Dictionary* [NBD]). However, there are many examples in the Pāli Nikāyas themselves where this interpretation becomes problematic.

One problem of the fetters in relation to noble persons can be seen in the following well-known Nikāya passage. The stream-enterer, the once-returner, and the non-returner are defined in relation to their giving up a certain number of

<sup>1</sup> All translations from the Pali in this article are based on the PTS translations with my own changes and modifications to make the meaning clear. Mp II, 130: *uddhambhāgiyāni pañca bahiddhā saṃyojanāni nāma, ... uddham vuccati rūpārūpadhātu, tatth' uppatti-nipphādanato tam uddham bhajantī ti uddhambhāgiyāni.*

fetters (*saṃyojana*) and the arahant in relation to his destruction of cankers (*āsava*). The passage reads:

Monks, who is the first recluse [= stream-enterer]? Here a monk after the vanishing of the three fetters has entered the stream, has forever escaped the woe, is affirmed, assured of final enlightenment.

Then, who is the second recluse [= once-returner]? After the vanishing of the three fetters and the attenuation of passion, hatred, and delusion, the monk returns only once more to this world. And only once more returning to this world, he puts an end to suffering.

Who is the third recluse [= non-returner]? After the vanishing of the five lower fetters, however, the monk becomes one who is spontaneously born (*opapātika*) [as a being in a Brahmā world] and there he reaches complete nibbāna without ever returning from that world.

Who is the fourth recluse [= arahant]? But after the vanishing of cankers (*āsavā*), being cankerless, he reaches already in this world, the freedom which is concentration, the freedom which is understanding, after personally experiencing and comprehending that state.<sup>1</sup>

As this passage conveys, one becomes a stream-enterer by eradicating three fetters; a once-returner by weakening passion, hatred, and delusion in addition to the first three; and a non-returner by eradicating all of the five lower fetters.

<sup>1</sup> A II 238: *idha bhikkhave bhikkhu tiṇṇaṃ saṃyojanānaṃ parikkhayā sotāpanno hoti avinipātadhammo niyato sambodhiparāyano. ayaṃ bhikkhave samaṇo; idha bhikkhave bhikkhu tiṇṇaṃ saṃyojanānaṃ parikkhayā rāgadosamohānaṃ tanuttā sakadāgāmi hoti sakid eva imaṃ lokaṃ āgantvā dukkhass' antaṃ karoti. ayaṃ bhikkhave dutiyo samaṇo; idha bhikkhave bhikkhu pañcannaṃ orambhāgiyānaṃ saṃyojanānaṃ parikkhayā opapātiko hoti tattha parinibbāyī anāvattidhammo tasmā lokā. ayaṃ bhikkhave tatiyo samaṇo; idha bhikkhave bhikkhu āsavānaṃ khayā anāsavaṃ cetovimuttiṃ paññāvimuttiṃ diṭṭh' eva dhamme sayaṃ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajja viharati. ayaṃ bhikkhave catuttho samaṇo.*

However, according to the phrasing, one becomes an arahant not by eradicating all of the fetters but by destroying all of the cankers. The phrase used there is, "after the vanishing of cankers, being cankerless" (*āsavānaṃ khayā anāsavaṃ*).

These two ways of describing the four noble persons, one in terms of fetters and the other in terms of cankers, also compel us to question the validity of the standard traditional list of ten fetters. According to the Pali Buddhist tradition the person who has destroyed the five lower fetters becomes an arahant only after also destroying the five higher fetters. However, the passage cited above does not make any reference to the five higher fetters and states clearly that one becomes an arahant after destroying cankers. One way to solve this question is to ask: Are the five higher fetters and the cankers the same? Is one a version of the other? Are cankers and the fetters more or less the same?

There are lists of either four or three types of cankers (*āsava*) in the Pāli texts. (1) Sensual pleasure (*kāmāsava*), (2) existence (*bhavāsava*), (3) speculative views (*diṭṭhāsava*), and (4) ignorance (*avijjāsava*) form the four. The one omitted in the list of three is the canker of speculative views. Perhaps this is because speculative views are due to ignorance.<sup>1</sup> The goal of practising the Buddhist path is to achieve complete freedom from the cycle of becoming, from rebirth, in any of the three realms: the sensual realm, the form realm, and the formless realm (S V 56).

So if one becomes an arahant with the destruction of all cankers one has transcended all three realms. This means that with the vanishing of the canker of sensual desire, one becomes free from the sensual realm, and with the vanishing of the cankers of existence and ignorance, one becomes free from both the realms of form and the formless. This is analogous to the meaning of the fetters, and it leads us to

<sup>1</sup>For the list of four cankers, see D II 81 and A I 165; for the list of three cankers, see S V 56.

9/7

conclude that cankers and fetters are more or less the same. Therefore, the difference, it seems, lies mostly in the terms used rather than in the meaning.

However, there are many other problems with this grading of noble persons according to their destruction of fetters. The various types of non-returners are a case in point. For instance, it is difficult to judge the difference between the first *antarāparinibbāyin* and the second *antarāparinibbāyin* in terms of fetters. It seems, however, that there was a common belief among the early Buddhists that one becomes a non-returner by getting rid of the five lower fetters. For instance, a householder once came to the Buddha and said that he did not see any one of the five lower fetters in himself. The immediate reply that the Buddha gave to this person was: "You have declared the fruit of non-returning" (S V 117). This means that in general one can be certain of being a non-returner when one knows that one is completely free from those five lower fetters.

After looking at various descriptions of the noble persons, however, it is difficult to think that the destruction of the five lower fetters is the only means of identifying a non-returner. Moreover, it is difficult to conclude that the five fetters are the only fetters that the non-returner has broken. Many stock passages in the Nikāyas do not name the individual fetters. A reason for this might be that when the Buddha used the terms "lower fetters" and "higher fetters" his listeners easily understood what he meant. Perhaps the Buddha did not want to create a fixed list of fetters because his original idea was to convey the nature of one's spiritual attainment by using a popular concept.

The following stereotypical passage on non-returners is an example: *idha bhikkhave bhikkhu pañcannaṃ orambhāgiyānaṃ saṃyojanānaṃ parikkhayaṃ opapātiko hoti tatha parinibbāyī anāvattidhammo tasmā lokā. ayaṃ bhikkhave tatiyo samaṇo* (A II 238). "Through the disappearance of the five lower fetters a monk becomes an *opapātika* and reaches

complete nibbāna without ever returning from that world.”<sup>1</sup> As is evident from this passage and its context, the disappearance of the five lower fetters is given as the key to becoming a non-returner but they are not further identified.

It seems that the standardization of noble persons in relation to fetters took place early in Buddhist history as a response to the need for classifying and describing the differences between Buddhist noble persons. However, the Nikāyas themselves show the fallibility of such attempts. For example, texts say that the difference between the once-returner and the non-returner lies in the fact that sensual desire and ill-will have partially vanished in the former, while they have completely vanished in the latter.

According to the stock passage on the once-returner (A IV 380), however, once-returners, in addition to their loss of the first three fetters, are also partially free from passion, hatred, and delusion (*rāgadosamohānaṃ tanuttā*). Accordingly, the fourth and the fifth lower fetters should be passion and hatred or a combination of passion, hatred, and delusion. But in the list of the five lower fetters, the fourth and the fifth are named as sensual desire (*kāmarāga*) and ill-will

<sup>1</sup>The term *opapātiko* is noteworthy. According to the PED, it means: “arisen or reborn without visible cause (i.e. without parents), spontaneous rebirth, ... apparitional rebirth”. According to NBD the term means “accidental, ... spontaneously born, i.e. born without the instrumentality of parents.” BD says further that *opapātika* “applies to all heavenly and infernal beings.” The Mahāsihanādasutta names four *opapātika-yonis*: heavenly beings, hell beings, some human beings, and some purgatory beings (M I 73). Among these *opapātika-yonis*, where can the non-returner be born? Since the non-returner has already transcended the sensual realm, his becoming an *opapātiko* cannot be in any of the six heavenly worlds, the human world, or any lower world. Since the beings in the Brahmā worlds are also born as *opapātika*, that is, without parents, the phrase *opapātiko hoti* in the cited non-returner formula must refer to one’s becoming an inhabitant in a Brahmā world. On the term *opapātika*, see also Joy Manné (1995), JPTS XXI, pp. 78–80.

10/7

(*vyāpāda*). It is likely that passion and hatred correspond to sensual desire and ill-will respectively. Although delusion (*moha*) is mentioned above as a third factor that one lessens with the attainment of once-returning, in the list of the five higher fetters, ignorance (*avijjā*), which tallies with delusion, is given as the last, a factor that should be got rid of with the attainment of arahantship.

This means, no doubt, that both the once-returner and the non-returner have also attenuated their ignorance to a certain level together with the rest of the fetters which are not in the list of five higher fetters. It also shows that linking this classification of noble persons to a fixed list of fetters was the result of a deliberate attempt by early Buddhists to seek consistency in the Buddha’s sporadic contextual teachings.

## II

Two lists of non-returners are found in the Nikāyas. One list consists of five non-returners and the other of seven. It is interesting to note that the texts giving these lists often avoid discussing the noble persons in relation to fetters. In the following pages, I will briefly discuss several of these lists in relation to textual sources. By doing so, I intend to bring out the dilemma caused by the idea of the ten fetters in categorizing Buddhist noble persons.

## List A (S V 201)

1. The arahant
2. [non-returners]
  - i. The *antarāparinibbāyin*
  - ii. The *upahaccaparinibbāyin*
  - iii. The *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - iv. The *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - v. The *uddhaṃsoto akaniṭṭhagāmin*
3. The once-returner
4. [stream-enterers]
  - i. The dhamma-follower (who is on the path to stream-entry)

- ii. The faith-follower (who is on the path to stream-entry)

In this list, the five non-returners are placed after the arahant. According to the text, the arahant has perfected the five spiritual faculties, namely:

1. faith,
2. energy,
3. mindfulness,
4. concentration,
5. wisdom.

The non-returners are inferior to the arahant because they have not perfected the five spiritual faculties. The differences among the five non-returners also lie in the degree of development of those five spiritual faculties. Among the non-returners, the *antarāparinibbāyin* is the highest in rank and the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* is the lowest.

At A IV 380, we find another description of noble persons with no reference to fetters, where it states that as far as the threefold categorization of morality, concentration, and wisdom is concerned, all these non-returners have the same standing: they have all perfected morality and concentration, and they have all yet to perfect wisdom. This does not imply that the non-returners have not developed the faculty of wisdom at all. All the non-returners have developed the five spiritual faculties, though less so than the arahant, so we can assume that they have developed the faculty of wisdom to a high level.

Moreover, according to A II 183, one experiences the destruction of cankers through wisdom. This means that in order to become a non-returner, one must destroy some cankers and attenuate others, sensual desire in particular; and to do so one should possess a high level of wisdom. The textual statement that one becomes a once-returner after attenuating lust, hatred and delusion (*rāgadosamohānaṃ*

11/7

*Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters* 133  
*tanuttā*) also supports this view, though it contradicts the traditional understanding in terms of the five fetters.

## List B (A IV 379–81)

1. [non-returners]
  - i. The *antarāparinibbāyin*
  - ii. The *upahaccaparinibbāyin*
  - iii. The *asāṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - iv. The *sasāṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - v. The *uddhamsoto akaniṭṭhagāmin*
2. The once-returner
3. [stream-enterers]
  - i. The *ekabījī*
  - ii. The *kolaṃkolo*
  - iii. The *sattakkhattuparamo*

In this list all the noble persons are described as having residues of attachment (*saupādisesa*) but being no longer liable to birth in such unpleasant conditions as the hells, the animal world, the ghost world, or the demon world. In addition, the five non-returners are described as those who have perfected both morality and concentration; as those who must still perfect wisdom; and as those who have destroyed the five lower fetters. The once-returner, on the other hand, has perfected morality but not concentration and wisdom and is free from the three fetters and partially free from lust, hatred, and delusion. The three stream-enterers, as described here, have perfected morality only and have got rid of the first three fetters. We summarize this in the following chart:

	Non-Returners	Once-Returners	Stream-Enterers
morality	perfected	perfected	perfected
concentration	perfected	not perfected	not perfected
wisdom	not perfected	not perfected	not perfected
first three lower fetters	destroyed	destroyed	destroyed
next two lower fetters	destroyed	partially destroyed	not destroyed



1. [stream-enterers]
  - i. The *sattakkhattuparama*
  - ii. The *kolamkola*
  - iii. The *ekabīji*
2. The once-returner
3. [non-returners]
  - i. The *antarāparinibbāyin*
  - ii. The *upahaccaparinibbāyin*
  - iii. The *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - iv. The *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - v. The *uddhamsota akanitthagāmin*
4. The arahant (*yo ca diṭṭhe va dhamme arahā*)

All five types of non-returners in this list, as is stated in the text, attain complete nibbāna after leaving this world (*idha vihāya niṭṭhā*), and the rest (the three stream-enterers, the once-returner, and the arahant) attain their complete nibbāna here in this world (*idha niṭṭhā*). In understanding these noble persons, it is important to note that the Nikāyas often list two occasions on which one can attain liberating insight (*aññā*): (1) here and now or (2) at the time of one's death. The above list and one at A I 234-35 add a third occasion: (3) after one's physical death.

Accordingly, the five non-returners in the above list achieve their perfection after leaving this world (*idha vihāya niṭṭhā*), while the *sattakkhattuparama*, the *kolamkola*, the *ekabīji*, the once-returner, and the one who is an arahant here and now achieve their perfection in this world (*idha niṭṭhā*). This means that non-returners may achieve their complete nibbāna after death and in a place other than the sensual realm. The text continues by saying that all these ten noble persons have entered the stream (*sotāpannā*); are endowed with (constructive) views (*diṭṭhisampannā*); have unwavering confidence in the Buddha (*aveccappasannā*); and are firm in belief (*niṭṭhaṅgatā*).

12/7

According to the above three lists,<sup>1</sup> there are five kinds of non-returner. It is interesting to note that all of the non-returners in these lists are described without reference to the ten fetters. As seen above, they are defined in relation to either the five spiritual faculties, the perfection of morality, concentration and wisdom, or the way they achieve their final nibbāna.

## List D (A IV 70-74)

1. [non-returners]
  - i. The first *antarāparinibbāyin*
  - ii. The second *antarāparinibbāyin*
  - iii. The third *antarāparinibbāyin*
  - iv. The *upahaccaparinibbāyin*
  - v. The *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - vi. The *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*
  - vii. The *uddhamsoto akanitthagāmin*
2. The arahant (*so āsavānaṃ khayā...*)

This list has seven types of non-returners because it divides the *antarāparinibbāyin* into three. The seven non-returners are named in this list as human destinies (*purisagatiyo*) and the arahant as one who attained complete nibbāna without any residue of attachment (*anupādā ca parinibbānaṃ*). All of the seven destinies are ways in which the non-returners attain complete nibbāna.

These five or seven non-returners are listed in order based on the level of each non-returner's progress on the path through developing spiritual qualities and breaking fetters. A textual passage (A I 234-35) that names the five types of non-returner states that one who perfects morality, concentration, and wisdom is most likely to become an arahant; otherwise, he is likely to become one of the five non-returners.

<sup>1</sup> See also, S V 69-70.

The person who trains himself in perfecting morality, concentration, and wisdom is able to accomplish, with the destruction of all cankers, the freedom which is concentration, the freedom which is insight here and now, within this life. If he fails to do so, with the destruction of the five lower fetters, he will be an *antarāparinibbāyin*; if he fails to be an *antarāparinibbāyin*, he will be an *upahāccaparinibbāyin*; if he fails to be an *upahaccaparinibbāyin*, he will be an *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*; if he fails to be an *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, he will be a *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*; if he fails to be a *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, he will be an *akaniṭṭhaparinibbāyin*, a person who is in the upper stream, heading towards Akanittha.

These non-returners are rated according to when, where, and how they achieve final nibbāna. Considering this hierarchy in relation to one's perfecting of the Buddhist path, we can conjecture that in the sevenfold classification of the non-returner too, if he who has perfected morality, concentration, and wisdom fails to become an arahant, he is likely to become an *antarāparinibbāyin* of the first level; if he fails the first level, then he will attain the second level; if he fails the second level, then he will attain the third level. If he fails to achieve all these, then, as in the list of five, the next highest level he can achieve is to become an *upahaccaparinibbāyin*.

In both the sevenfold and the fivefold classification, the differences among these non-returners are often given by referring not only to the fetters that they break but also to other forms of spiritual progress that they make. In one text, the differences between them are shown by similes. These similes convey to us what will happen to these non-returners after their physical death and when and how they will attain their complete nibbāna. According to that metaphorical description,

13/7

(1) the first *antarāparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off and cool down";<sup>1</sup>

(2) the second *antarāparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up and cool down";<sup>2</sup> and

(3) the third *antarāparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna "just as the bit may come off, fly up, and before touching the ground cool down."<sup>3</sup>

The three sparks of these three similes cool down before touching the ground, in other words, while they are in the air. From this we can assume that these three types of *antarāparinibbāyins* attain complete nibbāna while they are in *antarā*, an intermediate state, without being born to another life.

The similes that are given with reference to the other five types of non-returner, namely, the *upahaccaparinibbāyin*, *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, and the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*, bear a common characteristic. There the sparks cool down after touching the ground. Thus,

(4) the *upahaccaparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up, and after touching the ground cool down";<sup>4</sup>

(5) the *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna "just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up, and fall on some small heap of grass or sticks, kindle fire, kindle smoke, and consume that small heap and cool down from want of fuel";<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A IV 70-71: *papaṭikā nibbattivā nibbāyeyya*.

<sup>2</sup> A IV 71: *papaṭikā nibbattivā uppativā nibbāyeyya*.

<sup>3</sup> A IV 71: *papaṭikā nibbattivā uppativā anupahaccatalaṃ nibbāyeyya*.

<sup>4</sup> A IV 72: *papaṭikā nibbattivā uppativā upahaccatalaṃ nibbāyeyya*.

<sup>5</sup> A IV 72: *papaṭikā nibbattivā uppativā paritṭhā tīṇapuñje vā kaṭṭhapuñje vā nipateyya sā tattha aggim pi janeyya dhūmam pi janeyya aggim pi*

(6) the *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna “just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up, and fall on a large heap of grass or sticks, kindle fire, kindle smoke, and consume that large heap and cool down from want of fuel”;<sup>1</sup> finally,

(7) the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* attains complete nibbāna “just as from an iron slab, heated and beaten all day, a bit may come off, fly up, and may fall on a large heap of grass, heap of sticks, kindle fire, kindle smoke, and consume that large heap, set fire to the shrubland, set fire to the woodland and burning there, come to the edge of a green cornfield, upland, rock, water or lush countryside and there cool down from want of fuel.”<sup>2</sup>

The phrase “after touching the ground” in these readings indicates that these four non-returners attain complete nibbāna after being born in their next life, which, as is evident from other contexts, takes place in a higher realm.

The non-returners in these lists are often explained in the texts with little reference to the fetters.

The *upahaccaparinibbāyin* non-returner is listed immediately after the *antarāparinibbāyin*, so is one rank lower. Grammatically, the term *upahacca* is the absolutive form of *upahan(a)ti*; among others, it has the meanings of touch,

*janetvā dhūmam pi janetvā tam eva parittaṃ tiṇapuñjaṃ vā kaṭṭhapuñjaṃ vā pariyādiyitvā anāhārā nibbāyeyya.*

<sup>1</sup> A IV 73: *papaṭikā nibbattitvā uppatitvā vipule tiṇapuñje vā kaṭṭhapuñje vā nipateyya sā tattha aggim pi janeyya dhūmam pi janeyya aggim pi janetvā dhūmam pi janetvā tam eva vipulaṃ tiṇapuñjaṃ vā kaṭṭhapuñjaṃ vā pariyādiyitvā anāhārā nibbāyeyya.*

<sup>2</sup> A IV, 73-74: *papaṭikā nibbattitvā uppatitvā mahante tiṇapuñje vā kaṭṭhapuñje vā nipateyya sā tattha aggim pi janeyya dhūmam pi janeyya aggim pi janetvā dhūmam pi janetvā tam eva mahantaṃ tiṇapuñjaṃ vā kaṭṭhapuñjaṃ vā pariyādiyitvā gaccham pi daheyya dāyam pi daheyya gaccham pi dahitvā dāyampi dahitvā haritan taṃ vā patthaṃ taṃ vā setan taṃ vā udakaṃ taṃ vā ramaṇīyaṃ vā bhūmibhāgiyaṃ āgama anāhārā nibbāyeyya.*

strike, and reach. Accordingly, *upahaccaparinibbāyin* means the one who attains complete nibbāna after reaching, or touching, as in the spark simile, the ground. This means he attains complete nibbāna after being born into a next life.

As a non-returner, a *upahaccaparinibbāyin* is free from the five lower fetters (S V 69-70), but he still possesses both the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters that I think are the higher fetters. Therefore, on his death, the *upahaccaparinibbāyin* will be born in a pure Brahmā world, and attain complete nibbāna while living in that world.<sup>1</sup> This is because, though both the rebirth and existence fetters bind him, they are so weak that they could produce only one more life span. Buddhaghosa in his *Visuddhimagga* says that the *antarāparinibbāyin* attains nibbāna after reappearing anywhere in the Pure Abodes, before reaching the middle of his life span there, while the *upahaccaparinibbāyin* attains nibbāna after reaching the middle of his life span there (*Vism* 710, *Mp* II 330). In our view, there is no evidence in the *Nikāyas* to prove either that the *antarāparinibbāyin* is reborn in a new life or that the *upahaccaparinibbāyin* has to live pass the middle of his life span. However, it is clear that the *upahaccaparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna after being born in another life in the pure abodes.

<sup>1</sup> A set of five Brahmā worlds named as *Aviha*, *Atappa*, *Sudassa*, *Sudassi*, and *Akaniṭṭha*, are collectively called “pure abodes” (*D* III 237). In them only non-returners are born, and there they attain their complete nibbāna without ever returning to the sensual realm. *Vism* 710 classifies twenty-four types of non-returner who could live in these pure abodes. Since the inhabitants of those pure abodes are not liable to return to the sensual realm, *Bodhisattas* are never born in them. To become a Buddha one has to be born in the human world of the sensual realm (*Spk* I 50; *Bu-a* 224). The *Mahāsīhanādasutta* (*M* I 82) states that the Buddha, in his former lives as a *Bodhisatta*, had experienced almost all forms of birth except the birth in those “pure-abodes”, because if he had been born in them he would not have come back to this world again. However, there are stories which relate that the Buddha, sometimes visited the inhabitants of these pure abodes (*suddhāvāsā*), and vice versa (*D* II 50).

The next two non-returners are the *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin* and the *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*. The word *asaṅkhāra* has two meanings. One, found in the Saṃyutta-nikāya (III, 112), is “devoid of formation aggregate”. The other, found in later texts, is “unprompted” (Vism 452-53). According to the latter meaning, *asaṅkhāra* means automatic, unprompted, done by oneself without any encouragement, and *sasaṅkhāra* means prompted, encouraged by others.<sup>1</sup> Buddhaghosa in his Visuddhimagga says that the *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin* reaches the highest path (nibbāna) without prompting, with little effort, while the *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin* reaches the highest path with prompting, with effort (Vism 710). In the Aṅguttara-nikāya (II 156), where we find four types of non-returners, the *asaṅkhāra* and the *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyins* are further classified into two types. The four are:

1. the *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna here and now (*diṭṭheva dhamme sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyī hoti*);
2. the *sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna after his physical death (*kāyassa bhedaṃ sasaṅkhāraparinibbāyī hoti*);
3. the *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna here and now; and
4. the *asaṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, who attains complete nibbāna after his physical death.

This fourfold classification shows that both the *asaṅkhāra*- and the *sasaṅkhāra-parinibbāyins* may attain complete nibbāna here and now in this world. However, this seems to contradict the passage at A IV 119-20 which describes both these non-returners as attaining perfection after leaving this world.

<sup>1</sup> See also CPD on these terms; also see Edgerton's BHSD on: *anabhis-asaṅkhāra-parinirvāyin*.

15/7

The last non-returner in the lists of five and seven is called *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*. The literal meaning of the word *uddhamsota* (Skt *ūrdhva-srotas*) is “going upstream.” Thus the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* means “the person who goes upstream to Akaniṭṭha.” In Dhammapada 218 the *uddhamsota* is described as “One should be eager, determined, and suffused with thought; [such a] one, whose thought is not attached to sensual pleasures, is called an ‘upstreamer’.”<sup>1</sup>

The idea that the *uddhamsota* non-returner goes upstream conveys that he is to be reborn in any of the five pure Brahmā worlds, from Aviha to Akaniṭṭha. He goes up from Aviha to Atappa, from Atappa to Suddassa, from Sudassa to Sudassi, from Sudassi to Akaniṭṭha, without turning back to be born in a lower world (see Pp 17; Pp-a 199). This means that those non-returners who are born in Atappa will never be born in Aviha, but may be born in Sudassa or Sudassi or Akaniṭṭha. Those five Brahmā worlds, which are known as the Pure Abodes, are the only places where the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* can be born. The *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* is born in those pure dwellings because he still possesses both the rebirth and existence fetters.

### III

How do fetters relate to non-returners? A II 133-34 names four types of people in relation to their having, partially having, or not having three types of fetters. The once-returner is explained in this context as someone who has yet to eliminate

1. the fetters that lead to lower realms (*orambhāgiya-saṃyojana*),
2. the fetters that bring birth (*uppattiṭṭhābhika-saṃyojana*), and

<sup>1</sup> See also DhP-a III, 289-290; Thī 12.

3. the fetters that bring existence (*bhava-paṭilābhika-samyojana*).

This text does not refer to higher fetters but instead introduces rebirth and fetters.<sup>1</sup> It may be that both the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters constitute the higher fetters.

The text then goes on to explain the difference between the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin* and the *antarāparinibbāyin*. Both are non-returners. For the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*, although the five lower fetters have vanished, the rebirth and existence fetters still exist. For the *antarāparinibbāyin*, on the other hand, there exist neither the lower fetters nor the rebirth fetters; yet he still has the existence fetters. And for the arahant all these three types of fetters have vanished completely. Though this text elucidates the difference between these three categories of noble persons, it does not identify what these rebirth fetters and existence fetters are. We note, however, that this threefold classification tallies with It 96, where we find the categorization of noble persons into once-returned, non-returned, and arahant.

The once-returned, according to A II 133-34, comes back and is reborn in the lower realm because in him even the five lower fetters have not completely vanished. This means that the once-returned has still to eliminate all three types of fetter in order to attain complete nibbāna. On the other hand, the arahant has completely eliminated all three types: the lower fetters, rebirth fetters, and existence fetters. In this context, this text names only two types of non-returners: the first and

<sup>1</sup>The commentary on this passage seems very unclear. It says: *uppatti-paṭilābhīyānī ti yehi anantarā uppattiṃ paṭilābhāti. bhavapaṭilābhīyānī ti uppattibhavassa paṭilābhāya paccayā*: Mp III, 130-31. Then it says: *sakadāgāmissā ti idaṃ appahīnasamyojanesu ariyesu uttamakoṭṭiyā gahitaṃ; yasmā pana antarā-parinibbāyissa antarā uppatti n' atthi — yaṃ pana so tattha jhānaṃ samāpajjati, taṃ kusallatā uppattibhavassa paccayo t' eva saṃkhaṃ gacchati — tasmā 'ssa uppattipaṭilābhīyānī samyojanāni pahīnāni bhavapaṭilābhīyānī samyojanāni appahīnānī ti vuttaṃ.*

147

the last of the list of five, namely, the *antarāparinibbāyin* and the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*.

Since all types of non-returners have eradicated the five lower fetters, they differ from each other only according to whether they have eliminated the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters (in other words, the five higher fetters?). For instance, those non-returners who are known as the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmins* have yet to eradicate both the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters. Those non-returners who are known as the *antarāparinibbāyins* have already eradicated the rebirth fetters, and they still eradicate the existence fetters, which is why they are still only non-returners. Then the other three types of non-returners that should come between the *uddhamsota-akaniṭṭhagāmin*, the last, and the *antarāparinibbāyins*, the first, could differ from each other with regard to their level of destruction and attenuation of the rebirth fetters and the existence fetters.

In this regard too, the traditional list of ten fetters is problematic and elusive.

If the non-returners have further to eradicate the five higher fetters, those fetters, according to the list of the ten, should be

1. the desire for form,
2. desire for formless,
3. pride,
4. restlessness,
5. ignorance.

If we assume that the desire for form and the desire for formless states constitute the rebirth fetters, then there still remains the problem of identifying the existence fetters. Conversely, if we were to understand existence fetters to be the desire for form and the desire for formless, then the problem of identifying the rebirth fetters would remain unsolved. We have seen that A II 133-34 states that for non-returners there still remain the fetters that bring existence

(*bhavapaṭilābhikasamyojana*); again, It 96 states that for non-returners there still remains the bond of existence (*bhavayoga*). Considering these references to a fetter called the desire for existence, it is puzzling to find no such fetter in the traditional list of ten fetters, more specifically among the five higher fetters.

It seems to me that the listing of “restlessness” (*uddhacca*) among the five higher fetters was first a textual corruption and then slipped into the tradition to become part of the standard list. In the place of “restlessness”, it is better to read the fetter called “desire for existence”. It is also possible that in the original list there were three fetters, (desire for form, desire for formless, and desire for existence), and then the early redactors or copiers who understood the first two fetters as a division or expansion of the last deliberately replaced the last with restlessness. Here restlessness seems out of place. Restlessness, for instance, comes also among the five hindrances:

1. sensuous desire (*kāmacchanda*),
2. ill-will (*vyāpāda*),
3. sloth and torpor (*thīnamiddha*),
4. restlessness and scruples (*uddhaccakukkucca*),
5. sceptical doubts (*vicikicchā*).

Since one gets rid of sensual desire and ill-will before becoming a non-returner, one should also get rid of “restlessness” while in the first two noble stages, namely, stream-entry and once-return.

To support my view that the five higher fetters should include a fetter called desire for existence, I present two lists of fetters that we find somewhat hidden in the Nikāyas. Each list contains seven items. They are named “latencies”

17/7

(*anusaya*) in one context and “fetters” (*samyojana*) in another.<sup>1</sup> The list of seven latencies contains:

1. sensual lust
2. repugnance
3. views
4. skeptical doubts
5. pride
6. *desire for existence*,
7. ignorance.<sup>2</sup>

The list of seven fetters contains:

1. latencies (a corruption for sensual lust?)
2. repugnance
3. views
4. sceptical doubts
5. pride
6. *desire for existence*,
7. ignorance.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The difference between “fetters” and “latencies”, the titles given to the two canonical lists above, is important. A passage in the Majjhima-nikāya says that personality beliefs arise with regard to one’s own personality, *sakkāye sakkāyadiṭṭhi*; sceptical doubts arise with regard to the Buddha’s teachings, *dhammesu vicikicchā*; attachment to rules and rituals arises with regard to moral practices, *silesu sīlabbataparāmāso*; sensual desire arises with regard to sensual pleasures, *kāmesu kāmacchando*; and ill-will arises with regard to living beings, *sattesu byāpādo*. For a child, these fetters exist at a latent level (*anuseti*, *-anusayo*), and so must be called personality beliefs at a latent level, *sakkāyadiṭṭhānusayo*, sceptical doubts at a latent level, *vicikicchānusayo*, etc. On the other hand, mature people, because they do not know good people and their teachings, are not only obsessed by these fetters but do not understand how to eliminate them.

<sup>2</sup>S V 60, A IV 9: *satt’ ime bhikkhave anusayā. katame satta. kāmarāgānusayo paṭighānusayo diṭṭhānusayo vicikicchānusayo mānānusayo bhavarāgānusayo avijjānusayo.*

<sup>3</sup>A IV 7: *satt’ imāni bhikkhave saññojanāni. katamāni satta. anusaya-saññojanam paṭighasaññojanam diṭṭhisaññojanam vicikicchāsaññojanam mānasaññojanam bhavarāgasaññojanam avijjāsaññojanam.*

Yet another related list is found in the Majjhima-nikāya commentary, and its title, the fetters of existence (*bhava-saṃyojana*), has some bearing. This same list also appears in the Vibhaṅga (p. 391). The list includes:

1. sensual desire
2. repugnance
3. pride
4. views
5. sceptical doubts
6. attachment to rules and rituals
7. *desire for existence*
8. jealousy
9. avarice,
10. ignorance.<sup>1</sup>

In these three lists, the desire for existence is named before the fetter of ignorance, which comes last. In addition, it is important to recall the statement at A II 133-34, that for non-returners there are still the fetters of pride, desire for existence, and ignorance. We recall that this sutta mentions only these three types of fetter. Let us now take into account A IV 70-74. In explaining the seven non-returners, it says that the monk who considers:

“If it were not, it would not be mine; if it shall not become, it shall not become for me; what is, what has become, that I abandon” — acquires a state of equanimity. Then he finds pleasure neither in existence nor in a life to come, but sees with true wisdom that there is beyond a goal, a peace; yet not all in all is the goal

<sup>1</sup>Ps I, 43: *bhavasamyojanāni ti dasasamyojanāni: kāmarāgasamyojanam paṭigha-māna-ditṭhi-vicikicchā-sīlabbataparāmāsa-bhavarāga-issā-macchariyasamyojanam avijjāsamyojanam*. Vibhaṅga 391: *tattha kata-māni dasa samyojanāni? kāmarāgasamyojanam .... avijjāsamyojana*. It is interesting to note here that in Vibhaṅga 377, we find lower fetters and higher fetters named as in the traditional lists.

realized by him, nor all in all is the latent pride got rid of, nor that *latent desire for existence*, nor that latent ignorance. He, with the vanishing of the five lower fetters, becomes

one of the three types of *antarāparinibbāyin*, an *upahaccaparinibbāyin*, an *asāṅkhāraparinibbāyin*, a *sasāṅkhāraparinibbāyin* or an *uddhamsota-akanitṭhagāmin*. According to this text, all the seven non-returners still possess at a latent level three types of defilement, namely:

1. pride,
2. *desire for existence*,
3. ignorance.

With these supporting sources, it is justifiable to conclude that either we should list the higher fetters as consisting of

1. desire for form,
2. desire for formless,
3. pride,
4. desire for existence,
5. ignorance.

Or we should not take the list of the five higher fetters so rigidly and literally, since the listing of fetters varies from context to context. In my opinion, among the higher fetters, the desire for form and the desire for the formless can be regarded as the rebirth fetters for non-returners, and the rest of the fetters, the desire for existence in particular, must be the existence fetters. This is a reasonable conclusion because the non-returners will never come back to be born in the sensual realm, and the only possibility for their rebirth is either in the form realm or in the formless realm. Moreover, those who are born anywhere are in existence, subject to birth and death.

## IV

A discussion of the concept of *antarā-bhava* is crucial to an explanation of both the *antarāparinibbāyins* and the fetter of existence that we have just introduced into the traditional list of ten fetters. As seen earlier, the *Ānguttara-nikāya* (A II 133-34) recognizes a clear difference between rebirth (*uppatti*) and existence (*bhava*), the rebirth fetters (*uppatti-paṭilābhika-saṃyojana*) and the existence fetters (*bhava-paṭilābhika-saṃyojana*). In addition, It 96, by stating that for non-returners there exists only the bond of existence, identifies a division between the bond of sensual pleasure (*kāmayoga*) and the bond of existence (*bhavayoga*). This division between birth and existence can also be seen from the *paṭicca-samuppāda* formula, which states: "Conditioned by clinging, existence comes to be; conditioned by existence, birth comes to be."<sup>1</sup>

The *antarāparinibbāyin* non-returners will not be born again, but they are still subject to existence or becoming (*bhava*). This means that they are still in the realm of *samsāra*. For instance, a type of *antarāparinibbāyin* attains complete *nibbāna* after their physical death in this world but before being born into a next life. This is exemplified in the spark simile where a spark of a heated and beaten iron slab comes off, goes up into the air and cools down before touching the ground. What happens to the *antarāparinibbāyins* who are not liable to be born again? Where are they living when they attain final *nibbāna*?

To answer these questions, there is no alternative but to assume the existence of an intermediate state for these non-returners. The *antarāparinibbāyins* cannot be born again since they do not have the rebirth fetters; and yet they should continue to exist after their physical death because they still possess the existence fetters. Then, where do they attain final *nibbāna*, unless it be in an intermediate state? This makes us

<sup>1</sup> *upādāna-paccayā bhavo bhava-paccayā jāti.*

believe that these non-returners survive their physical death and continue to exist in some form without being born into another life. They will not be born into another life because in them the rebirth fetters which cause one to be reborn exist no more.

This existence of life in between (*antarā*), that is, after one's death and before birth into a next life, is called the *antarābhava*, the intermediate existence. Although this idea of the intermediate existence cannot be viewed through our limited evidence as somewhere for all sorts of beings to linger until they find a proper place to be reborn, in the case of the *antarāparinibbāyins* that is the only possibility.

Though the idea of *antarābhava* entered Buddhism in its developmental period, some evidence in the *Nikāyas* shows that it must have been a concept familiar to the earliest Buddhist communities. The idea of the *gandhabba*'s coming into the mother's womb for a new conception is a case in point.<sup>1</sup> It is not clear from where the *gandhabba* comes to the mother's womb or what this *gandhabba* means. *Sutta-nipāta* 147 names two types of sentient beings: *bhūtā* "beings who already exist" and *sambhavesī* "beings waiting to be born." Again, it is not clear who and where these beings are. Some may also question the meaning of *antarā* in *Dhp* 237. The verse reads:

upanītavayo va dāni si  
sampayāto si Yamassa santike,  
vāso pi ca te n' atthi antarā  
pātheyyam pi ca te na vijjati.

The meaning of this verse is, "Your life has come near to an end; you have arrived in the presence of Yama (the king of Death); there is no resting place for you in-between; you do

<sup>1</sup> See *MI* 265-266: *yato ca kho bhikkhave mātāpitaro ca sannipatitā hoti, mātā ca utunt hoti, gandhabbo ca paccuṣaṭṭhito hoti, evaṃ tinnaṃ sannipātā gabbhassāvakkanti hoti.*



not even have what is necessary for the road.” The word *antarā* might in this context refer to an intermediate state of existence.

The word *antarā* in the following passage of the S IV 59 is also controversial. Venerable Cunda is explaining to Channa some teachings of the Buddha:

*nissitassa calitaṃ. anissitassa calitaṃ natthi. calite asati passaddhi hoti. passaddhiyā sati nati na hoti. natiyā asati agatigati na hoti. agatigatiyā asati cutupapāto na hoti. cutupapāte asati nevidha na huraṃ na ubhayam antarena. esevanto dukkhassā ti.*

In him who clings, there is wavering. In him who clings not, there is no wavering. Where there is no wavering, there is calm. Where there is calm, there is no inclination. Where there is no inclination, there is no wrongdoing. Where there is no wrongdoing, there is no vanishing and reappearing. If there be no vanishing and reappearing, there is no here nor yonder nor yet between the two. That is the end of suffering.

What does the phrase *na ubhayam antarena* mean here except an intermediate state of existence? It is true that the commentaries on such passages often try to deny the idea of an intermediate state of existence. The commentary on the passage just cited says, “This is the only meaning here. Some, taking the words *ubhayam antarena*, tend to think of an intermediate existence. They talk nonsense. The existence of an intermediate existence has indeed been denied in the Abhidhamma. The word *antarena* here is to show an

alternate view. Therefore, the meaning should be: not here, not yonder, not both, the other alternative.”<sup>1</sup>

No matter how slight these pieces of evidence are, they cannot be disregarded. The Theravādins, however, denied the existence of an intermediate existence even for the *antarāparinibbāyins*. This denial is evident not only from the discussion in the *Points of Controversy* (Kathāvattuppakaraṇa) on the disputed point: “that there is an intermediate state of existence”, but also from the commentarial explanations of the *antarāparinibbāyins*. According to these sources, the Pubbaseliyas and the Sammitīyas, on the one hand, accepted an *antarā-bhava*, and the Theravādins, on the other hand, denied it.<sup>2</sup> The Theravāda argument was, “If there be such a state, you must identify it with the sensual realm, or form realm, or formless realm, which you refuse to do.” This unconvincing argument is repeated at *Points of Controversy*, pp. 212-13.

Because of this denial, Theravādins have to interpret the *antarāparinibbāyins* in a way that goes against the Nikāya explanations of the rebirth and existence fetters and the implications of the sparks similes applied to non-returners. In its commentary on the sparks similes, the commentary of the Aṅguttara-nikāya (Mp IV 39), for instance, says that the *antarāparinibbāyin* attains complete nibbāna by the extinction of all defilements during the period from his arising but before the middle of his life span in that realm. In other words, the commentary says that the *antarāparinibbāyin*

<sup>1</sup>Spk II, 373: *ayam eva hi ettha attho. ye pana ubhayam antarenā ti vacanam gahervā antarā bhavaṃ icchanti. tesam vacanam niratthakam. antarābhavassa hi bhāvo Abhidhamme paṭikkhitto yeva. antarenā ti vacanam pana vikapp’ antaradīpanam. tasmā ettha attho: n’ eva idha na huraṃ aparo vikappo na ubhayan ti.*

<sup>2</sup>“The Sarvāstivādins, the Sammatīyas, and Pūrvasāilais firmly believed in an ‘intermediate existence’ (*antarābhava*) that linked death and rebirth. This concept was rejected by the Theravādins and the Mahāsāṃghikas.” *Encyclopedia of Religion* Vol. II, p. 449.

21/7

attains complete nibbāna after being born into a next life in a Brahmā world.

This interpretation not only contradicts the implications of the sparks simile of the Aṅguttara-nikāya but is also unfounded. It is certain that the main aim of this commentarial interpretation of the Theravādins is to avoid the notion of an intermediate existence. It contradicts the Nikāya explanation which clearly points out the non-existence of the rebirth fetters for the *antarāparinibbāyins*. If rebirth fetters are non-existent, how can they be born into a next life? The view of the Nikāyas seems to be that to be born again, one must have rebirth fetters.

The rejection of an intermediate existence continues even in modern Buddhist scholarship. Interestingly, but surprisingly, these rejections are made on the basis of commentaries and some purely Theravādin texts. Kalupahana and Tamura, for instance, in their article on *antarābhava* in *The Encyclopædia of Buddhism*, say:

*Antarābhava*, intermediate existence or existence between death in one life and rebirth in the other, [is] a philosophical concept belonging to the later schools of Buddhist thought and [is] foreign to early Buddhism. The belief in a "being" connecting two actualised individualities (*attabhāva*) and bridging the gulf between death in one life and birth in the next, a belief influenced by the animistic association of the soul-theories of earlier Brahmanism, is quite inconsistent with the basic teachings of early Buddhism.<sup>1</sup>

Kalupahana and Tamura simply show us the traditional Theravādin view of *antarā-bhava*, but to our surprise they make no inquiry into the concepts of *antarāparinibbāyin* non-returners, the *bhava-paṭilābhika* fetters, or any other relevant sources in the Nikāyas. There is no doubt that the

<sup>1</sup> Vol I, Fasc. 4 (Government of Ceylon, 1965), pp. 730-33.

Theravādins are compelled to reject the concept of *antarā-bhava* because of their fear of soul (*atta*). That is to say, Theravādins always make some attempts to avoid those concepts which, according to them, may affirm or imply the existence of a soul.

The issue that we are raising here is not whether the affirmation of *antarā-bhava* compromises the non-self theory of Buddhism or whether it is inconsistent with other Buddhist teachings. Our concern is simply to point out that the Theravāda view which says that the *antarāparinibbāyins* will be born again is wrong, contrary to the teaching of the Pali Nikāyas.<sup>1</sup> Kalupahana and Tamura, who completely neglected those Nikāya references, should not have made the generalization that the concept of "*antarā-bhava*... is foreign to early Buddhism", if by "early Buddhism" they mean the teachings of the Pāli Nikāyas.

## V

In conclusion, let us check our emended list of ten fetters against the *antarāparinibbāyin* non-returners and the non-returners in general.

Emended list of ten fetters	Antarāparinibbāyin Non-Returners	Non-Returners in general
A. The five lower fetters		
1. personality belief	no	no
2. sceptical doubts	no	no
3. attachment to rules and rituals	no	no
4. sensual desire	no	no
5. ill will	no	no

<sup>1</sup> For some secondary materials on *antarā-bhava* see Alex Wayman, "The Intermediate-State Dispute in Buddhism", in *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, edited by L. Cousins et al. (Reidel Publishing Company, 1974); and Peter Masefield, *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1986), pp. 105f.

B. The five higher fetters  
(rebirth fetters)

6. desire for form	no	yes
7. desire for the formless	no	yes
8. pride	yes	yes
9. desire for existence	yes	(restlessness) yes
10. ignorance	yes	yes

This makes it clear that the traditional list of ten fetters does not make sense of the differences between the types of non-returner. The traditional teaching that one becomes a non-returner by getting rid of the five lower fetters totally ignores differences among non-returners or indeed among any noble persons besides the main four. As we saw above, there are non-returners who are known as *antarāparinibbāyins* and who have got rid of at least two of the five higher fetters.

G.A. Somaratne

## Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the Related Literature

In 1992, I published the edited text of the Migapotaka-vagga and the Uttarōḷiya-vagga of Vedeha's Rasavāhinī (Ras), which is based upon my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Göttingen<sup>1</sup>. As Telwatte Rahula had completed the romanized edition of the first four vaggas from manuscripts as his doctoral thesis submitted to the Australian National University in 1978, I edited the fifth and the sixth vaggas, that is to say, the first two vaggas of the Laṅkādi-puppattivatthūni, with the intention of continuing his work. Although my thesis was written in English, it seems that it has remained unknown on an international basis to most scholars of Pāli Buddhism and its literature because it was published in Japan. It was Prof. Oskar von Hinüber who suggested that I write a short article summarizing the contents of my book for those who are interested in this field in order to acquaint them with an idea of my work. It will be a great pleasure for me if this small contribution stimulates scholarly interest in Ras, one of the most popular post-canonical literatures in all Theravāda Buddhist countries.

Since a very good, compact explanation of Ras and its relation to other Pāli works, namely Sahassavathuppakaraṇa (Sah), the Sahassavathatṭhakathā (Sah-a) and the Rasavāhinī-ṭīkā (Ras-ṭ) is found in Prof. Oskar von Hinüber's *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (§§ 410–415),<sup>2</sup> it seems unnecessary to repeat it here. In my edition, preceding the intro-

<sup>1</sup>J. Matsumura (1992) : *The Rasavāhinī of Vedeha Thera, Vaggas V and VI: The Migapotaka-Vagga and the Uttarōḷiya-Vagga*, Osaka: Toho Shuppan. This published thesis also includes a summary and table of contents in Japanese.

<sup>2</sup>*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies*,<sup>3</sup> Vol. 2, Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

B. The five higher fetters  
(rebirth fetters)

6. desire for form	no	yes
7. desire for the formless	no	yes
8. pride	yes	yes
9. desire for existence	yes	(restlessness) yes
10. ignorance	yes	yes

This makes it clear that the traditional list of ten fetters does not make sense of the differences between the types of non-returner. The traditional teaching that one becomes a non-returner by getting rid of the five lower fetters totally ignores differences among non-returners or indeed among any noble persons besides the main four. As we saw above, there are non-returners who are known as *antarāpari-nibbāyins* and who have got rid of at least two of the five higher fetters.

G.A. Somaratne

## Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the Related Literature

In 1992, I published the edited text of the Migapotaka-vagga and the Uttarōḷiya-vagga of Vedeha's Rasavāhinī (Ras), which is based upon my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Göttingen<sup>1</sup>. As Telwatte Rahula had completed the romanized edition of the first four vaggas from manuscripts as his doctoral thesis submitted to the Australian National University in 1978, I edited the fifth and the sixth vaggas, that is to say, the first two vaggas of the Laṅkādi-puppattivatthūni, with the intention of continuing his work. Although my thesis was written in English, it seems that it has remained unknown on an international basis to most scholars of Pāli Buddhism and its literature because it was published in Japan. It was Prof. Oskar von Hinüber who suggested that I write a short article summarizing the contents of my book for those who are interested in this field in order to acquaint them with an idea of my work. It will be a great pleasure for me if this small contribution stimulates scholarly interest in Ras, one of the most popular post-canonical literatures in all Theravāda Buddhist countries.

Since a very good, compact explanation of Ras and its relation to other Pāli works, namely Sahassavattahuppakaraṇa (Sah), the Sahassavattathakathā (Sah-a) and the Rasavāhinī-ṭikā (Ras-t) is found in Prof. Oskar von Hinüber's *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (§§ 410–415),<sup>2</sup> it seems unnecessary to repeat it here. In my edition, preceding the intro-

<sup>1</sup>J. Matsumura (1992) : *The Rasavāhinī of Vedeha Thera, Vaggas V and VI: The Migapotaka-Vagga and the Uttarōḷiya-Vagga*, Osaka: Toho Shuppan. This published thesis also includes a summary and table of contents in Japanese.

<sup>2</sup>*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies*, Vol. 2, Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

duction, I have given a bibliography of all printed editions and translations of the Ras and relevant literature. That bibliography also includes much information about Sinhalese editions with paraphrases called *sannaya*, and editions and translations in other oriental languages such as Burmese and Thai.

I have also made a complete bibliography of the printed editions of the Saddharmālaṅkāraya (Sdhlk), a Sinhalese version of Ras written by Devarakṣita Jayabāhu Dharmakīrti (Dhammakitti) around the end of the fourteenth or at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and its commentaries. Prof. Heinz Bechert of the University of Göttingen spent a great deal of time and effort collecting the greater part of the books that are given in this bibliography for the Institute of Indology and Buddhist Studies (Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde). I will show later how this Sinhalese text, Sdhlk, is important in editing Ras. And his collection of these old Sinhalese printed books has become an invaluable treasure trove for us today, since these books may be very difficult to obtain outside of Sri Lanka.

In the introduction to the text I have dealt with the history of research covering the further elucidation of Ras (§ 1), discussion about the question of authorship (§ 2), the source of the stories in Ras (§ 3), the relation of Ras and Sdhlk (§ 4), Ras in South-East Asian countries (§§ 5-6), the relation of Ras to the Saddhammasaṅgaha (§ 7), commentaries on Ras, such as Ras-ṭ, the Rasavāhinī-gāthāsannaya, and the Rasavāhinī-gāṭapadaya (or -gaṇṭhipada) (§ 8), a description of the manuscripts of Ras I made use of (§ 9), problems of orthography (§ 10), editorial principles (§ 11), metrical analysis (§ 12), summaries of stories and their parallels (§ 13), and a table of verse parallels (§ 14).

I have given a transliteration of the text of Ras-ṭ in an appendix dealing with Ras V and VI, and of the colophon of Ras-ṭ from MS Or 6601 (90) in the British Library, to show evidence that this commentary is closely related to the South-

East Asian Ras tradition. I also give evidence to show that it was most probably composed not in Sri Lanka but somewhere in one of the other Theravāda Buddhist countries, and consequently, I conclude that the Sinhalese printed text is unreliable because the Sinhalese editors in those days had a strong tendency to change the readings in manuscripts to conform with other printed texts. Besides this transliteration, I added a concordance of verses in my edited text, the Sinhalese edition (C), Sdhlk, Ras-gāthāsannaya and the Madhura-rasavāhinīvatthu (the Burmese version of Ras), a concordance of stories in Ras, Sdhlk and Sah, and indices of words and phrases discussed in the notes to the text and of proper names in the text.

One focus of my work is to attempt to settle the dates for Vedeha, the author of Ras. Two of the most learned scholars of Pāli literature, S. Paranavitana and G. P. Malalasekera, held totally different views, the former ascribing Vedeha to the eleventh or to the twelfth century, and the latter placing him in the fourteenth century. How can such a difference of opinion have occurred? It seems it was because the early Pāli philologists were not careful enough in identifying authors of many literary works. Authors of post-canonical Pāli literature were usually Buddhist monks, and they very often had the same, quite common name of Ānanda, or Dhammakitti, etc. The different views of the two scholars also came about due to the careless identification of Vedeha's teacher, Ānanda.

According to the colophon of Ras, his teacher (guru) Ānanda was called Araṇṇāyatan'-Ānanda, "Ānanda, whose abode is the Forest". In the colophon to another of his works, the Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā, Vedeha praises his teacher as Araññaratan'-Ānanda, "The Forest Jewel, Ānanda", and Vedeha called himself *araññāvāsī*, which means that Vedeha and his teacher belonged to the Forest Fraternity (called *vanavāsī* or *araññāvāsī*). Malalasekera rightly identified this

Ānanda with the author of the Padasādhana-sannaya, Ānanda Vanaratana, "Ānanda, the Jewel of the Forest".

On the other hand, Paronavitana noticed the fact that the author of the Pajjamadhu, Buddhappiya, also called his teacher Ānand'-Araññaratana. So far there was no problem. However, he further identified this Ānanda with the Ānanda Tambapaṇṇiddhaja, "Ānanda of the banner of Tambapaṇṇi" (= Laṅkā), who was the teacher of the author of the Rūpasiddhi, since the latter was also called Buddhappiya. This unjustified identification of the two Ānandas and the two Buddhappiyas seems to have become one of the reasons for much of the confusion that we confront when we try to establish teacher-pupil inheritance in the Sri Lanka mediæval Buddhist schools.

The Ānanda who is entitled Tambapaṇṇiddhaja is quite safely identified with the thera named Ānanda who was praised in the inscription of Sundaramahādevī, the queen of Vikkamabāhu II (1116-37), as "a banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā". And this is the main reason why Paronavitana ascribed Vedeha to the eleventh to twelfth century, since he was a co-pupil with Buddhappiya of this "Ānanda".

Buddhappiya as the author of the Rūpasiddhi was, however, referred to in the Padasādhana written by Piyadassi, to which Vedeha's teacher, Ānanda of Araññaratana, wrote a *sannaya*. This fact obviously contradicts the above-mentioned fact that Pajjamadhu's author, Buddhappiya, was a pupil of Ānand'-Araññaratana. The contradiction is, however, very simply resolved if we suppose that two different Ānandas and two different Buddhappiyas existed: namely, Ānanda of Tambapaṇṇiddhaja and his pupil Buddhappiya who was also called Coḷiya-Dīpaṅkara (the name suggests that he was an Indian native) and whose dates are quite clearly settled in the twelfth century; and Ānanda of the Forest Fraternity (with the title of Araññaratana, Vanaratana, or Araññāyatana as in Ras), one of whose pupils was Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu.

Now according to the Padasādhana-sannaya, Ānanda's teacher was Medhaṅkara of Udumbaragiri who lived during the reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232-36). On the other hand, we know from the Sāratthasamuccaya that its author, whose name seems to be unknown, also had Ānanda of Araññaratana as his teacher, and besides this that he was a contemporary of Anomadassi, whose date was clearly settled around the reign of Parakkamabāhu II (1236-71) based upon Mhv LXXXVI, 36-39.

The above is a very condensed outline of my discussion of the evidence of the Vedeha's date. In short, Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu; Anomadassi, the author of the Sāratthasamuccaya; and Vedeha were all pupils of Ānanda, belonged to the Forest Fraternity, and were more or less contemporary. And so we may be allowed to ascribe Vedeha's date to the latter half of the thirteenth century. I examined this puzzle by closely comparing the colophons of each relevant work. And through this procedure I discovered a very important fact: the titles or sobriquets given to the distinguished monks were not mere casual fancies, but important marks or signs by which Sinhalese Buddhists of the middle ages recognized those bearing the same names. I would like to emphasize here the necessity of this kind of detailed historical examination of post-canonical Pāli literature with more attention to author identification.

The second major theme of my research is to identify the source of Ras. According to the opening verses of Ras, Vedeha states that his work is a revision of a previous work by Rāṭṭhapāla of Guttavaṃkapaṇṇa at the Mahāvihāra, which is, in its turn, a Pāli translation of the ancient collection of stories transmitted in the language of the island (*dīpabhāsā*), i.e. the Sinhalese language. Walpola Rāhula identified Rāṭṭhapāla's work with Sah, which was published in 1959 by A.P. Buddhadatta. W. Rāhula's argument concerning the identification of Sah as Rāṭṭhapāla's work is sound, and more evidence for this identification can be

added, especially the fact that the order of stories in Sah and Ras is not arbitrary, but that the order of stories in Sah is clearly reflected in Ras, as though Vedeha sorted the stories in Sah into two parts almost automatically: those stories related to India (Jambūdīpa) and those related to Sri Lanka (Lankādīpa).

Problems remain, however. The stories in Sah are usually quite simple, and contain few verses. On the other hand, in Ras the stories are more elaborately related and sometimes contain information not found in Sah. The most conspicuous difference is that Ras contains many verses, some of which are quoted from Mhv and the Apadāna, and in those cases Vedeha himself makes definite statements, such as *tena vuttam Mahāvamse*, etc. It is interesting that he also mentions *porāṇā* as the source of verses. Although I could identify some of these *porāṇā* verses as coming from the Saddhammopāyaṇa, it does not seem that Saddh is the direct source for these verses. Both Ras and Saddh rather owe them to a common source. However, verses introduced with definite source names are very limited in number. In most cases, verses are only introduced with phrases like *tena vuttam*, *tathā hi*, *vuttam hi*, or *gāthāyo bhavanti*, etc. Although these expressions indicate that those verses also have their own source, it is very difficult to find parallels of them in other Pāli literature. It is noteworthy that some verses are found to have their parallels in the Rājaratnākara, a Sinhalese historiographical work, in which verses are in Pāli, which is usual for similar Sinhalese literature of around that time.

From the above discussion we can already understand that Sah alone cannot be the single source of Ras. Moreover, Ras contains stories not found in Sah in the form we have it today. The question then arises: where did Ras adopt these stories that are missing in Sah from? At this point the relation of Sah and the Sahassavatthattakathā (Sah-a), which is quoted or mentioned four times in Mhv-ṭ, comes

into dispute<sup>1</sup>. W. Rāhula mistakenly seems to regard Sah and Sah-a as one and the same work. S. Mori compared the Sah-a quotations in Mhv-ṭ with Sah and Ras more carefully and concluded that Sah-a represents the earlier stage of the Sah transmission and that Sah and Sah-a are essentially one and the same work. However, Mori, *a priori*, thought Sah-a was written in Pāli and did not pay attention to Malalasekera's suggestion that "Rāṭṭhapāla's translation is drawn from the ancient Sahassa-vatthu-āṭṭhakathā ... quoted four times in Mahā-vam̐sa-ṭikā".<sup>2</sup> He suggested that Sah-a is the original Sinhalese work (*sīhalāṭṭhakathā*) from which Rāṭṭhapāla made a translation into Pāli. And I have come to be of the same opinion in the course of my research, although it is very difficult to draw a definitive conclusion.

The place showing most conclusive evidence in favour of Malalasekera's idea is, however, the last reference of Sah-a in Mhv-ṭ 607,8-9 in the romantic story of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇī's son Prince Sāli and his caṇḍāla wife (Mhv-ṭ 605,1-608,8). Sah gives the title of the Sāliṛājakumāravatthu, but omits the whole story, advising the readers to refer to the "Mahāvam̐sa" for the story (*Sāliṛājakumārassa vatthu Mahāvam̐se vuttanayena veditabbaṃ. Sāliṛājakumāravatthu dutiyaṃ*). It is obvious that the "Mahāvam̐sa" mentioned in the passage cannot be the Mahānāma's metrical work, Mhv, since Mhv reports the story with only three verses (Mhv XXXIII 1-3). We may think that it refers to the story in Mhv-ṭ. However, the story in Mhv-ṭ reports the miracles

<sup>1</sup>O. von Hinüber's explanation that "The latter text is quoted three times in Mahv-ṭ [sic.]" (*op. cit.*, p. 190), is not quite correct. He does not count the passage, Mhv-ṭ 453,31 (*eso pi khīrasalākabhaddāyako ti tath' eva vuttam.*), as a reference to Sah-a. It is evident that *tath' eva* indicates the work mentioned in the immediately preceding quotation, *i.e.* Mhv-ṭ 452,27-28 (*so pi Kassapasammāsambuddhakāle khīrasalākabhaddāyako ti Sahassavatthattakathāyaṃ vuttam.*).

<sup>2</sup>G.P. Malalasekera (1928; reprinted 1958): *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon*. Colombo: Gunasena, p. 225.

which happened at the birth of Prince Sāli, and following this description, Mhv-ṭ 607,8-9 reports: "it is said in the Sahassavatthattakathā that the same [miracles] also happened on the occasion of [each of] the seven celebrations" (*sattasu pi 'ssa maṅgalesu tath' eva ahosī ti Sahassavatthattakathāyaṃ vuttam*). From this it is obvious that the author of Mhv-ṭ relates the story based upon a source other than Sah-a, and he here compares the two versions found in the two different sources.

We cannot know whether it was the author of Sah who omits the story, or if it was already omitted in the original Sinhalese work upon which Sah is based. However, Ras relates the Prince Sāli's story in full, and we find in it the passage whose content corresponds exactly to the statement in Mhv-ṭ:

*Tassa mātukucchito nikkhamanakālasamanantaram eva sakala-Lankādīpe sālīvassam vassi. Antamaso uddhane thapitakaṅgu-ādīnaṃ bhattam parivattetvā sālibhattam eva ahosi. Kaṅguvarakādiparipūritakoṭṭhāgārāni pi parivattetvā sālīm eva ahosum. Tuccchakoṭṭhāgārāni pi tath' eva paripunnāni ahesum. Na kevalam jātadivase yeva, tassa temāsa-sattamāsa-navamāsa-maṅgalesu ca sitthappavesana-kaṅṇavedhana-uparājāṭṭhānādi-maṅgaladivase ca tath' eva Sīhaladīpe sālīvassam vassi.*<sup>1</sup>

At the very moment after he [Prince Sāli] came out of his mother's womb, sāli rice fell like rain on the whole Lankā island. Even millet or other grains to be cooked as a meal on fireplaces changed into sāli rice. In granaries fully filled with millet, beans and other [cereals], all [of the grains] changed into sāli rice. Empty storehouses were in the same way filled with [sāli rice]. This miracle happened not only on the day of his birth, but also on the

<sup>1</sup> Saranātissa (ed.), *Rasavāhinī*, (Colombo: 1891-93; 2nd impression, 1896), pt. 2, 108,17-23. Cf. Matsumura (1992), p. xlv.

days of his attaining the ages of three, seven, and nine months. It also rained sāli rice in exactly the same way on Sīhala island on ceremonial days such as the day of his weaning, the day of his ear-piercing, and on the day of his coronation as viceroy.

This correspondence does not seem unlikely, if we suppose that Sah-a was still available to Vedeha, or at least that the tradition of Sīhalāṭṭhakathā was not totally lost at his time.<sup>1</sup>

Another important point is the basis for principles of text editing methods. Since Ras is a very popular book with both monks and lay people, not only in Sri Lanka but in all other Theravāda Buddhist countries (where Ras is usually called Madhurasavāhinī or Madhurasavāhinī), over the centuries, countless manuscripts have been made. It is therefore impossible to establish a relationship among the limited number of manuscripts which we have access to. Moreover, manuscripts themselves usually give us scant information about their date, place, or scribe. So, my greatest concern is how we can treat the readings in the manuscripts logically and consistently. The following is a summary of my research, covering eighteen pages of the introduction of my thesis (§ 11).

In order to edit the text I used eight Sinhalese manuscripts (S1-S8), two Khmer manuscripts from Bangkok National Library (K1 and K2) and one modern Laotian manuscript (L). In addition, I used the oldest Sinhalese

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Matsumura, "Sahassavatthupparakaṇa wo meguru shomondai" ["On the Sahassavatthupparakaṇa"], *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. XLI, No. 1 (Dec. 1992), pp. 479-75; J. Matsumura, "Shīhara attakatā bunkenrui ni kansuru ichikousatu, sāri ōji monogatari wo daizai toshite" ["An Investigation of the So-called Sīhala-Āṭṭhakathā Literature: Comparing Three Versions of the Sāliṛājakumāra Tale"], *Kobe International University Review*, No. 53 (Dec. 1997), pp. 161-73.



edition of Ras by Saraṇatissa (C)<sup>1</sup> as a basis for collation. In the course of my work, I have found that the manuscripts are largely divided in two: one group which is almost identical with C (S3–S8), and another group which sometimes has very different readings from C (S1, S2, K1, K2 and L). Now the question is which group of manuscripts may be supposed to reflect more exactly the original form of Ras. To solve the question, I compared the readings with Sdhk, which contains the Sinhalese translation of all the stories in Ras.

As I mentioned above, Sdhk was written at the turn of the fourteenth to the fifteenth century by Dhammakitti, the abbot of the Forest Fraternity at Gaḍalādeṇi. Since the author of Ras, Vedeha, also belonged to the Forest Fraternity, we may be allowed to form the hypothesis that the Ras text which Dhammakitti made use of was very close to the original form of Ras. And as we may also suppose that because Sdhk was transmitted separately from Ras, Sdhk would serve as a criterion to judge which group of manuscripts more closely reflects the original form of Ras. The result was that Sdhk proved to reflect exactly the readings of the latter group of manuscripts. So I called the recension represented by the latter group of manuscripts “recension X”, and the one represented by the former group manuscripts “recension Y”.

We find the most striking differences between the two recensions at the beginning of Ras V.2, where recension Y and C omit a long description of the prosperity of Mahāgāma, the capital of Rohaṇa; and Ras VI.10, where they both omit the ten verses describing the beauty of Anurādhapura (VI.10); while recension X shares word-for-word correspondence with these two places in Sdhk. For this reason, I chose as the first and most important principle that the text of my edition of Ras would be based upon the group of manuscripts

<sup>1</sup>See note 5. I actually made use of the second impression of Saraṇatissa's edition, because it was the oldest of all the Sinhalese editions to which I had access.

designated recension X. As a result I believe I identified the Ras text belonging to recension X, which is sometimes quite different from the popular Sinhalese editions of Ras.

The last point I would like to emphasize is the problem of Sinhalese printed editions of Ras. Complete editions of Ras have been published only in Sri Lanka up to now, and they seem to be derived from the the edition by Saraṇatissa,<sup>1</sup> which is the oldest edition and which I designated C. So we may suppose that C represents all the Sinhalese printed editions. In the course of my work, I found a very curious problem in C: the readings of the prose part coincide with the recension Y manuscripts, with some emendations;<sup>2</sup> but a larger number of verses in C are not found in that form in any manuscripts of Ras, or some verses in C coincide with the recension X manuscripts.

For example, a most striking difference can be found in V.7 (Samaṇagāma-vatthu). Verse 13 of this vagga consists of five pādas: four Triṣṭubh-Jagatī pādas followed by one Vasantatilaka pāda according to the manuscripts:

*Viśādhike sattasate samantā  
adhikehi chabbīsasatehi satta,  
parivenapantīhi ca dassanīyo  
tatth' āvasantī yatirājaputtā,  
kāyādisaṇṇa-m-aratā paripuṇṇasīlā.*

C makes two verses of four pādas each, discarding the most unpleasant Vasantatilaka pāda, and this reading is attested only by the Gāthāsannaya and Sdhk:

*Viśādhike sattasate samantā  
adhikehi chabbīsasatehi satta,*

<sup>1</sup>There is also an edition in Roman script by S. Gandhi (Delhi, 1988), but it is merely a careless transcription from a Sinhalese edition. Cf. Von Hintüber, *op.cit.*, p. 191, n. 684.

<sup>2</sup>For example, the singular nominative of *mātugāma-* appears in our manuscripts always as a feminine (*mātugāmā*), which C usually reads as a masculine (*mātugāmo*).

29/7

*parivenapanīhi sudassanīyo  
pītiṃ pavaddheti sadā janānaṃ.  
Tahiṃ vasantā yatirājaputtā  
supesalānekagunādhivāsā,  
katādarā sabbajanehi sammā  
karonti attatthaparathasiddhiṃ.<sup>1</sup>*

In C we often find “improved” verses like these which are not attested to by any of our manuscripts, and in such cases C’s readings are usually attested to by the Gāthāsannaya and Sdhlk, especially by the Gāthāsannaya. From this and other observations I surmise that the one who introduced such improvements to the verses is Dhammakitti, the author of Sdhlk, and that the compiler of the Gāthāsannaya made use of Sdhlk along with Ras transmitted in the form of manuscripts. There is a good reason for the compiler of the Gāthāsannaya to use Sdhlk. Although Dhammakitti did not adopt all the verses of Ras in the original Pāli into Sdhlk, he gave a Sinhalese paraphrase of all the verses of Ras, even of those whose original Pāli text he omitted, and this Sinhalese paraphrase of verses, I suppose, may have been of great use for the compilation of the Gāthāsannaya.

From the circumstances discussed above, we may conclude that the editor of C adopted its verses not directly from Ras manuscripts but most probably from the Gāthāsannaya, which had been transmitted separately from the Ras text. Therefore we must say that the Ras text of the Sinhalese editions cannot be consistent. They are artificially made from the Ras manuscripts and the Gāthāsannaya, and probably also using Sdhlk.

Ras has been a very popular and widely read collection of religious narratives among Buddhists not only in Sri Lanka but also in other Theravāda Buddhist countries, and there still exist innumerable manuscripts kept in temples and libraries. Nevertheless, we do not have a critically edited text

of Ras, despite the obvious need of one for the reasons discussed above. Although my contribution may be small, I hope that it will stimulate scholars who are interested in the post-canonical Pāli literature to continue the attempt to publish a critical edition of the entire text of Ras,<sup>1</sup> for I believe that Ras itself is not only very important as historiography but also as one of the most sophisticated works in literature produced in mediaeval Sri Lanka, supplying us with much information about the lively culture of Theravāda Buddhists.

Junko Matsumura

<sup>1</sup> According to a letter from Mr Sven Bretfeld of the University of Göttingen which I received in May 1997, he intends to edit Ras VII.3–VIII.3, the vaggas which narrate the story of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi and his

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE RASAVĀHINĪ  
(Editions and translations)

A. Sinhalese printed editions and translations

1. Complete editions

- a. Saraṇatissa, ed. *Rasavāhinī*. Colombo: Laṅkābhīṇṇā Viśruta Press, 1891–93 (not accessible to the present author. Cf. W.A. de Silva, "A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters", *JPTS* 1910–12, p. 148, no. 154).

The following reprints were accessible to the author:  
2nd impression, [Colombo]: Vijjāsāgara, 2439 B.E. (A.D. 1896).

3rd impression, Colombo: Jinālaṅkāra, part 1, 2444 B.E. (A.D. 1901); part 2, 2443 B.E. (A.D. 1889).

7th impression of part 1 and 4th impression of part 2 bound together in one volume, [Colombo]: Jinālaṅkāra, part 1, 2483 B.E. (A.D. 1939); part 2, 2470 B.E. (A.D. 1926).

- b. M. Somaratana, ed. *Rasavāhinī*. Colombo: Jinālaṅkāra Press, 1906 (not accessible to the present author; cf. de Silva, *op.cit.*, p. 148, no. 155).

- c. Kiriāllē Nāṇavimala, ed. *Rasavāhinī*. Colombo: Guṇasēna, 1961.

2. Partial editions and Sinhalese translations

- d. [Ras I–IV] Polvatta Siri Sudassi, ed. *Rasavāhinī* (*Paṭhamo Bhāgo*). Ambalaṅgoḍa: Laṅkāputta Muddaṇālaya, 2493 B.E. (A.D. 1951).

- e. [Ras I with *īkā*] Silōgama Sōbhita, ed. *Rasavāhinī*. Colombo: Guṇasēna, 1962.

- f. [Ras I.4–7] G.K.F. Wickramasekera, ed. *Rasavāhinī* (*Prescribed for the J.S.C. Examination*). Kotagala: Barnes, 1936.

- g. [Ras I–II] L. Guṇaratna, ed. and tr.. *Rasavāhinī, Dhammasoṇḍa Vagga hā Nandirāja Vagga*. Colombo: Ratna Pot, n.d.

- h. [Ras V–VI] Nāvullē Dhammānanda, ed. and tr. *Rasavāhinī: Migapotaka-Uttaroliya Vagga*. Colombo: Jinālaṅkāra, 1963.

- i. [Ras V–VI] L. Guṇaratna, ed. and tr. *Rasavāhinī, Laṅkāḍīpuppattikathāvehi Migapotaka Vaggaya hā Uttaroliya Vaggaya*. Colombo: Ratnapot, 2527 B.E. (A.D. 1983).

- j. [Ras VII–VIII] Nikahāṭṭiyē Somānanda, ed. *Rasavāhiniya, 1–2-Yodhavarga*. Colombo: Guṇasēna [1960].

3. Editions with Sinhalese paraphrase (*sannaya*)

- k. [Ras I–IV] M.J. Dharmasēna, *Rasavāhinī-sannaya*. 1st impression, fasc. 3 (pp. 161–240), n.p.: Śrībhāratī, 2459 B.E. (A.D. 1915).

2nd impression, n.p.: Sevyasrī, 2471 B.E. (A.D. 1928).

3rd impression, fasc. 1 (pp. 1–80), [Colombo]: Vidyāprabodha, 2477 B.E. (A.D. 1934).

- l. [Ras I–IV] Mābōṭṭiyē Medhaṅkar, ed. *Pāṭhaśoḍhanapūrvaka Rasavāhinīvyākhyāva*, Bihalpola Śrī Devarakṣitābhīdhāna nāyaka māhimīyan vahansē visin liyana laḍī. 1st ed., A.D. 1917 (?); 2nd ed., 2473 B.E. (A.D. 1930).

- m. [Ras I] Devīnuvara Ratanajoti and Kuṇṇāgoḍa Piya-tissa, eds.. *Sanna sahita Rasavāhinī, Prathama Bhāgaya* (with *sannaya* by Bihalpola Devarakṣita). Colombo: Jinālaṅkāra, 2502 B.E. (A.D. 1958).

B. Other Oriental Editions

- a. [Ras I–IV] Ūḥ Janainda, ed. *Rasavāhinīpāli, Jambudīpuppatti kathākaṇḍa*. Rangoon: Sudhammavātī, 1930. B<sup>e</sup>.

- b. [Ras I-IV] Bhikṣu Mahānāma, ed. *Rasavāhinī, Jambudīpuppatti Kathā*. Lumbinī: Rājakīya Buddha Mandira, 1983. N<sup>o</sup>.

### C. Other Oriental Translations

#### 1. Complete translations

- a. Seng Manavidūra, tr. *Rasavāhinī*. Bangkok, 2513 B.E. (A.D. 1969). Thai translation from the 3rd impression of Saraṇatissa's Sinhalese edition (I-A-a).

#### 2. Partial translations

- b. [Ras I-IV] Ūḥ Ācar, tr. *Rasavāhinīvatthu, Jambudīpuppatti-kathā*. Charā Nāṇ, ed. Rangoon: Mramā amyuiḥ sāḥ cā Press, 1925. Burmese translation.
- c. [Ras I-IV] Bhikṣu Aniruddha, tr. *Rasavāhinī*, in 2 parts: part 1, Lumbinī: Lumbinī Dharmodaya Samiti 1979; part 2, Lumbinī: Rājakīya Buddha Mandira, 1980. Nepalese translation.
- d. [Ras V-VI] Anāgārikā Suśīlā, tr. *Rasavāhinī, Laṅkā-dīpuppatti Kathā*. Part 1, Omabahāla: Śākya Press, 1982. Nepalese translation; the Laṅkā section is to be published in 3 parts.

### D. European Editions (including English publications in Oriental countries) with or without translations

- a. [Ras I.1-4] Friedrich Spiegel, *Anecdota Pālica*. Leipzig, 1845, pp. 1-74. Edition in Devanāgarī script with German translation.
- b. [Ras I.5-6] Sten Konow, "Zwei Erzählungen aus der *Rasavāhinī*", *ZDMG* 43 (1889), pp. 297-307. Edition in Roman script with German translation.
- c. [Ras I.7] P.E. Pavolini, "Il Settimo Capitolo della *Rasavāhinī*", *GSAI* 8 (1894-95), pp. 179-86. Edition in Roman script with Italian translation.
- d. [Ras I.8-10] P.E. Pavolini, "*Rasavāhinī*, I 8-10", *GSAI* 10 (1896-97), pp. 175-98. Edition in Roman script with Italian translation.

- e. [Ras II] Magdalene and Wilhelm Geiger. *Die zweite Dekade der Rasavāhinī*. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, 1918, 5. Abhandlung. München, 1918. Edition in Roman script with German translation.
- f. [Ras I.1] D.J. Gogerly, "Buddhism", *The Orientalist*, vol. 1, part 9 (1884) pp. 204b-205b. A detailed English summary.
- 1999 g. [Ras I.3] W. Goonetilleke, "Comparative Folklore", *The Orientalist*, vol. 1, part 11 (1884), pp. 252a-55a. Text in Devanāgarī script and English translation (*avasānagāthā* is omitted).
- h. [Ras VII.2] Edmund R. Goonaratne. "The Telakaṭāhagāthā", *JPTS* 1884, pp. 53-54. Part of the text is quoted with English translation.
- i. [Ras I.9, IV.1, V.4, IX.4, IX.8, II.5] Dines Andersen, *Rasavāhinī, Buddhistiske Legender: paa dansk i udvalg med indledning*, Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforskning udgivne af det philologisk-historiske Samfund, no. 6. Kjøbenhavn, 1891. Danish translation.
- j. [Ras II.4] I.P. Minayeff. *Recherches sur le Bouddhisme: traduit du Russe par R.H. Assier de Pompignan. Annales du Musée Guimet*, tome 4. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1894. The text is quoted without any mention of the source. The original Russian work is not accessible to the author: I.P. Minaev, *Buddizm: isledovanija i materialy*, 1887.
- k. [Ras IV.8] H.C. Norman. "Buddhist Legends of Asoka and his Times: Translated from the Pāli of the *Rasavāhinī* by Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī", *JASB*, new series 6 (1910), pp. 57-72. English translation.
- l. [Ras III.6-10] Klaus Wille. *Rasavāhinī von Vedeha: Edition, Übersetzung und Quellenkritische Bear-*

32/7 1987  
Vol. XX

## The Sixty-four Destructions according to the *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*

### A. Introduction

Among the Sthavira tenets cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra in his *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*, which is preserved only in Tibetan translation, is a passage in prose and verse on the “sixty-four destructions” of the world or universe.<sup>1</sup> The citation occurs in Chapter 8, “Analysis of the Aeon” (*Kalpa-viniścaya*).<sup>2</sup> I have not been able to trace an *exact* counterpart of the passage in Pāli, although the prose is close to that of a number of texts, such as the *Visuddhimagga* and the *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*. The verse is very close to one cited without attribution (or ascribed to the “old masters”: *ten’ āhu porāṇā*)<sup>3</sup> in later Pāli works such as the *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*, *Sārasaṅgaha*,<sup>4</sup> *Lokadīpakasāra*,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>For Daśabalaśrīmitra and his work see Peter Skilling, “The *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya* of Daśabalaśrīmitra”, *Buddhist Studies Review* vol. 4, no. 1 (1987), pp. 3–23, and “Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation”, *JPTS* XIX (1993), pp. 140–42.

<sup>2</sup>Title from end of chapter: Peking Tanjur (Q) 43a6, Derge Tanjur (D) 140a5, *bskal pa mam par nes pa, ste* (Q: *jes bya ba for ste*, D) *l’eu brgyad pa’o*.

<sup>3</sup>For the “old masters” or “ancients”, see E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1953, Appendix II.

<sup>4</sup>Genjun H. Sasaki (ed.), *Sārasaṅgaha*, Oxford, 1992, p. 314, 20–21. Sasaki notes the occurrence of the verse in the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*, *Suttasaṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā*, and *Abhidhammathasaṅgaha-sanne*.

<sup>5</sup>Phra Saṅgharāja Medhaṅkara, *Lokadīpakasāra*, National Library, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, B.E. 2529 [1986], p. 513, 5–6.

*Mahākappalokasaṅṭhānapaññatti*,<sup>1</sup> and *Aruṇavatīsūtra*.<sup>2</sup> The first two works were composed at Pulatthinagara (Polonnaruva) in Ceylon: the *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī* by Sumaṅgala in the 12th century,<sup>3</sup> and the *Sārasaṅgaha* by Siddhattha at about the beginning of the 14th century.<sup>4</sup> The *Lokadīpakasāra* was composed by Medhaṅkara Mahāthera at "Mutta-managara, known as Siriratanapura" (present-day Martaban) in Rāmaññadesa in the 14th century.<sup>5</sup> The dates and provenance of the *Mahākappalokasaṅṭhānapaññatti* and *Aruṇavatīsūtra* are unknown; the latter is a non-canonical Pāli sutta, perhaps from Siam of the Ayutthaya period. The verse is cited in Pāli in a Thai cosmological text, *Description of the Three Worlds (Traibhūmikathā)*, traditionally held to have been composed by Phya Lithai in the mid-14th century in the Kingdom of Sukhothai (Sukhodaya).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Mahākappalokasaṅṭhānapaññatti*, typescript "transcribed from the palm-leaf MS. in the Royal Library at Bangkok, for the use of Professor Sylvain Levy (*sic*), by order of H.R.H. the Prince of Chandaburi. Bangkok, 1926", p. 5, 22-23.

<sup>2</sup> *Aruṇavatīsūtra* in *Lokuppatti Aruṇavatīsūtra Paṭhamamūla Paṭhamakaplae mūlatantraiy*, National Library, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, B.E. 2533 [1990], p. 52.7-8.

<sup>3</sup> Sasaki, p. ix.

<sup>4</sup> Sasaki, pp. vii-viii.

<sup>5</sup> *Lokadīpakasāra*, p. 617.6 (colophon); B.C. Law, *The History of the Buddha's Religion (Sāsanavaṃsa)*, 1st ed. Calcutta, 1952; reprint Delhi, 1986, pp. 53, 56.

<sup>6</sup> *Traibhūmikathā ru traibhūmiphraung*, Fine Arts Department, BE 2526 [1983], p. 139; translated by Frank E. Reynolds and Mani B. Reynolds, *Three Worlds According to King Ruang: A Thai Buddhist Cosmology*; (Berkeley, 1982), p. 306; translated by G. Cœdès and C. Archaimbault, *Les Trois Mondes* (Paris: École Française de l'Extrême-Orient, 1973), pp. 216-17.

The theory is the same as that of the Vaibhāṣikas, as outlined in the *Lokaprajñapti* and presented in detail in the *Abhidharmakośa*, *Abhidharmadīpa*, and *Sārasamuccaya*.<sup>1</sup>

The present article gives translations (Part B) and texts (Part C) of Daśabalaśrīmitra's citation, along with relevant passages from the *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*, *Visuddhimagga*, *Lokaprajñapti* and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

## B. Translations

### 1. *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*

According to the system of the *Āgama*<sup>2</sup> of the Ārya Sthavira school (*nikāya*), there are sixty-four destructions (*saṃvatta*) [of the world]. Therein, there are fifty-six destructions by fire, seven destructions by water, and one destruction by wind, in this manner:

- (1) there are seven destructions by fire in succession (*nirantaram*), [then] one by water;
- (2) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
- (3) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
- (4) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
- (5) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
- (6) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
- (7) after that, seven by fire, one by water;
- (8) after that, seven by fire, and one destruction by wind.

<sup>1</sup> Padmanabh S. Jaini (ed.), *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, Patna, 1977, pp. 116-17; *Sārasamuccaya-nāma-abhidharmāvatāra-ṭīkā*, Q5598, Vol. 119, *mñon pa thu*, 354b5-8. See below for the *Lokaprajñapti* and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

<sup>2</sup> *lung* = *āgama*: from the style of this and other citations it is clear that Daśabalaśrīmitra uses *āgama* in the sense of "tradition" or "authoritative text", rather than of "canonical text" in the sense of one of the four *Āgamas* (equivalent to the first four *Nikāyas* of the Pāli canon).

Thus there are altogether sixty-four destructions.<sup>1</sup> Further, it is stated:

After each seven turns by fire  
each eighth [turn] is by water:  
when the one final [turn] by wind is counted  
the sixty-four [destructions] are complete.

### 2. *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*

In this manner the world is destroyed seven turns by fire, and the eighth turn by water; then again seven turns by fire, and the eighth turn by water: in this manner eight groups of eight are completed when [the world] is destroyed for a final turn by water. ... Further, this is stated:

Seven times seven turns by fire  
each eighth [turn] by water:  
the sixty-four [destructions] are complete  
when there is one final [turn] by wind.

2

### 3. *Visuddhimagga*<sup>3</sup>

[The world] is destroyed for seven turns in succession by fire and the eighth turn by water; then again seven turns by fire and the eighth by water, and when it has been seven times destroyed by water at each eighth turn, it is again destroyed for seven turns by fire. Sixty-three æons pass in this way. And now the air takes the opportunity to usurp the water's turn for destruction, and in destroying the world it

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Dīghanikāya-aṅṅakathā* (Nālandā ed.) I 183,15, *ekasmim kappe catusaṅṅhi antarakappā nāma honti*.

<sup>2</sup> The translation by Cœdès and Archaimbault changes the number in the Pāli from sixty-three to sixty-four: "Sept fois [vient] le feu, la huitième fois c'est l'eau. [Ainsi] jusqu'à soixante-quatre fois; le vent vient seulement une fois."

<sup>3</sup> Translation from Bhikkhu Nānamoli, *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)* by Bhaddantācariya Buddhaghosa, 3rd ed. (Kandy, 1975), Chapter XIII ¶65 (p. 463).

demolishes the Subhakiṅha Brahmā World where the life-span is the full sixty-four æons.

### 4. *Lokaprajñapti*

There are three destructions: destruction by fire, destruction by water, and destruction by wind. ... There are seven destructions by fire, and one by water; there are seven destructions by water, and one by wind.

### 5. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*

In what sequence do these destructions occur? In succession, "Seven by fire": there are seven destructions by fire. Then, "One by water": immediately after seven destructions by fire, there is one destruction by water. "When seven [destructions] by water have occurred in this manner, again seven by fire": when seven destructions by water have occurred in this sequence, then there are seven destructions by fire. "After which there is the destruction by wind": after that there is one destruction by wind. ... There are fifty-six destructions by fire, seven destructions by water, one destruction by wind: thus the *Prajñaptibhāṣya* statement that "the life-span of the Śubhakṛtsna gods is sixty-four æons" is correctly interpreted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Lokaprajñapti*, Q5597, Vol. 115, *mñon pa khu 19a3 dge rgyas kyi lha rnams kyi tshē'i tshad kyi mtha' ni bskal pa drug cu rtsa bži ste*. Cf. *Sārasamuccaya*, *thu 354b7 de ltar byas na gdags pa bśad pa las dge rgyas kyi lha rnams kyi tshē bskal pa drug cu rtsa bži thub bo žes bya ba legs par bśad pa yin no*.

## C. Texts

1. *Samskr̥tāsamskr̥ta-viniścaya*<sup>1</sup>

'phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i luñ gi tshul las kyañ  
'jig pa ni drug cu rtsa bži ste/ de la mes 'jig pa lña bcu rtsa  
drug go/<sup>2</sup> chus 'jig pa ni bdun no// rluñ gis 'jig pa ni gcig go/  
'di lta ste/ bar med par mes 'jig pa bdun no// chus gcig go/ de  
nas mes bdun no// chus gcig go/ de nas mes bdun no// chus  
gcig go/ de nas mes bdun no// chus gcig go/ de nas mes bdun  
no// chus gcig go/ de nas mes bdun no// chus gcig go/ de nas  
mes bdun no// chus gcig go/ de nas mes bdun no// rluñ gis  
'jig pa ni gcig go/ de ltar bsdus te 'jig pa ni drug cu bži'o//  
yañ gsuñs te/

me yis lan ni bdun bdun la// brgyad pa brgyad pa chu yis  
so//

gañ tshe rluñ mchog gcig bgrañs na// drug cu bži ni  
rdzogs par 'gyur//

žes so//<sup>3</sup>

2. *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*<sup>4</sup>

tathā hesa loko sattavāresu agginā vinassati atthame vāre  
udakena, puna sattavāresu agginā atthame vāre udakenā ti  
evam pi atthasu atthakesu paripuñnesu pacchime vāre vātena  
vinassati ... vuttam pi c' etaṃ

<sup>1</sup>Daśabalaśrīmitra (sTobs bcu dpal bśes gñen), 'Dus byas dañ 'dus ma  
byas nam par nes pa, Peking (Q) 5865, Vol. 146, no mtshar bstan bcos  
ño, 24a1-5; Derge (D) 3897, Vol. 108, dbu ma ha, 124b2-5.

<sup>2</sup>go / Q : go // D, throughout.

<sup>3</sup>Lines a and b are identical to the Pāli: me yis = agginā; lan = vārā;  
bdun bdun la = satta satta; brgyad pa brgyad pa = atthame atthame;  
chu yis so = odakā. Line c has one variant: gañ tshe = yadā; rluñ mchog  
= vāyuvaro; gcig = eko; but bgrañs = "counted" rather than siyā. In line  
d, drug cu bži = catusatthī; rdzogs par 'gyur = puññā.

<sup>4</sup>Thai script edition, *Abhidhammatthasaṅgahapāliyā saha abhi-  
dhammatthavibhāvinī nāma abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṭṭikā*, Mahāmakuta-  
rājavidyālaya, Bangkok BE 2516 [1973], Chapter 5, p. 162.10-17.

satta sattagginā vārā atthame atthamodakā  
catusatthī yadā puññā eko vāyuvaro siyā.

3. *Visuddhimagga*<sup>1</sup>

evaṃ vinassanto pi ca nirantaram eva satta vāre agginā  
vinassati (Mm: *nassati* HOS) atthame vāre udakena, puna  
satta vāre agginā, atthame vāre udakenā ti evaṃ atthame  
atthame vāre vinassanto sattakkhattuṃ udakena vinassitvā  
puna satta vāre agginā vinassati (Mm: *nassati* HOS). ettāvātā  
tesatthi kappā atītā honti. etth' antare udakena nassanavāraṃ  
sampattam pi paṭibāhitvā laddhokāso vāto paripuññacatu-  
satthikappāyuke subhakiṇhe viddhamṣento lokam vināseti.

4. *Lokaprajñapti*<sup>2</sup>

'jig pa ni nam pa gsum ste, mes 'jig pa dañ, chus 'jig pa  
dañ, rluñ gis 'jig pa'o ... mes 'jig pa lan bdun žiñ chus 'jig  
pa lan cig, chus 'jig pa lan bdun žiñ rluñ gis 'jig pa lan cig  
'byuñ ño.

5. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*<sup>3</sup>

kena punaḥ krameṇaitāḥ saṃvartanyo bhavanti? niran-  
taraṃ tāvat *saptāgninā* sapta saṃvartanyas tejasā bhavanti.

<sup>1</sup>Henry Clarke Warren and Dharmananda Kosambi (eds.), *Visuddhimagga  
of Buddhaghosācariya* (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 41, 1950; reprint  
Delhi, 1989), Chap. XIII, ¶65, p. 356.8-14 (= HOS); Thai script edition,  
*Visuddhimagga nāma pakaraṇavisesassa dutiyo bhāgo*, 5th ed.,  
Mahāmakutaṛājavidyālaya, Bangkok, B.E. 2515 [1972], p. 269.7-14 (= Mm). The prose is incorporated into the *Sārasaṅgaha* (p. 314.8-16) and  
*Lokadīpakasāra* (p. 512.25-13.3).

<sup>2</sup>Jig rten bžag pa, Q5597, Vol. 115, mñon pa khu, 54b4-7.

<sup>3</sup>P. Pradhan (ed.), *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, (revised 2nd  
ed.) Patna, 1975, 191.6-18; Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Abhi-  
dharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Spuṣārthā  
Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, Part II, Varanasi, 1971, pp. 565.4-  
566. See also Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de  
Vasubandhu*, tome II, reprinted Brussels, 1971, pp. 216-17. The text of  
*Kośakārikā* III, 102 is given in bold type.



tataḥ *adbhir ekā* saptānām tejaḥsaṃvartanīnām anantaram adbhīḥ saṃvartanī bhavati. *evaṃ gate 'dbhiḥ saptake punaḥ, tejasā saptakaḥ* etena krameṇāpsaṃvartanīnām gate saptake punaḥ tejaḥsaṃvartanīnām saptako bhavati. *paścād vāyusaṃvartanī tataḥ* paścād ekā vāyusaṃvartanī bhavati. ... *ṣaṭpañcāśat tejaḥsaṃvartanyaḥ saptāpsaṃvartanyaḥ ekā vāyusaṃvartanī.* *evaṃ ca prajñaptibhāṣyaṃ sunītaṃ bhavati catuḥṣaṣṭi kalpāḥ śubhakṛtsnānām devānām āyuhpramāṇam iti.*

Nandapurī

Peter Skilling

## Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters in the Pāli Nikāyas

This article concerns what the Pāli Nikāyas have to say about the *antarāparinibbāyin* non-returners and their desire for existence and the life in an intermediate existence.<sup>1</sup> I shall argue that this material casts doubt on a major point of Theravāda orthodoxy.

The following are the four noble persons presented in Pāli Buddhism:

1. The stream-enterer (*sotāpanno*)
2. The once-returner (*sakadāgāmi*)
3. The non-returner (*anāgāmi*)
4. The arahant (*araham*) (S V 200).

The Buddha stated that it was only in his teaching that one could find these four noble persons.<sup>2</sup> The meanings of

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to Professor Richard F. Gombrich (University of Oxford) for his suggestions which helped me to improve the content of this article. I also appreciate the help given by Professor George D. Bond and the late Professor Edmund F. Perry (Northwestern University) in articulating my initial thoughts into an article.

<sup>2</sup>It is not difficult to understand why Buddhist teaching was so appealing to many sorts of people. It seems Buddhism's diverse ways of presenting many noble stages and persons could embrace a variety of spiritual needs and levels of spiritual development. Buddhism could introduce arahantship here and now for those who came to it seeking no more rebirths. It could offer the stage of non-return for those who came with the aspiration to have an experience in a higher world before attaining the final goal. It could offer the stage of once-return for those who would like to come back to this world one more time to have more experiences as humans before attaining the supreme goal. Finally, it could offer the stage of stream-entry for those who are not really tired of either world but would like to have an assurance of attaining the supreme goal one day. This is also evident from the fact that all the arahants that we find in the Nikāyas are either monks or nuns. There is no reference to living lay

tataḥ *adbhir ekā* saptānāṃ tejaḥsaṃvartanīnāṃ anantaram  
adbhiḥ saṃvartanī bhavati. *evaṃ gate 'dbhiḥ saptake punaḥ,*  
*tejasā saptakaḥ* etena krameṇāpsaṃvartanīnāṃ gate saptake  
punaḥ tejaḥsaṃvartanīnāṃ saptako bhavati. *paścād vāyu-*  
*saṃvartanī tataḥ* paścād ekā vāyusaṃvartanī bhavati. ...  
ṣaṭpañcāśat tejaḥsaṃvartanyaḥ saptāpsaṃvartanyaḥ ekā  
vāyusaṃvartanī. *evaṃ ca* prajñaptibhāṣyaṃ sunītaṃ bhavati  
catuḥṣaṣṭi kalpāḥ śubhakṛtsnānāṃ devānāṃ āyuhpramāṇam  
iti.

Nandapurī

Peter Skilling

S.H.7

## Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters in the Pāli Nikāyas

This article concerns what the Pāli Nikāyas have to say about the *antarāparinibbāyin* non-returners and their desire for existence and the life in an intermediate existence.<sup>1</sup> I shall argue that this material casts doubt on a major point of Theravāda orthodoxy.

The following are the four noble persons presented in Pali Buddhism:

1. The stream-enterer (*sotāpanno*)
2. The once-returner (*sakadāgāmi*)
3. The non-returner (*anāgāmi*)
4. The arahant (*arahant*) (S V 200).

The Buddha stated that it was only in his teaching that one could find these four noble persons.<sup>2</sup> The meanings of

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to Professor Richard F. Gombrich (University of Oxford) for his suggestions which helped me to improve the content of this article. I also appreciate the help given by Professor George D. Bond and the late Professor Edmund F. Perry (Northwestern University) in articulating my initial thoughts into an article.

<sup>2</sup>It is not difficult to understand why Buddhist teaching was so appealing to many sorts of people. It seems Buddhism's diverse ways of presenting many noble stages and persons could embrace a variety of spiritual needs and levels of spiritual development. Buddhism could introduce arahantship here and now for those who came to it seeking no more rebirths. It could offer the stage of non-return for those who came with the aspiration to have an experience in a higher world before attaining the final goal. It could offer the stage of once-return for those who would like to come back to this world one more time to have more experiences as humans before attaining the supreme goal. Finally, it could offer the stage of stream-entry for those who are not really tired of either world but would like to have an assurance of attaining the supreme goal one day. This is also evident from the fact that all the arahants that we find in the Nikāyas are either monks or nuns. There is no reference to living lay

38/7

The Journal of the Pali Text Society

Vol. XXV (1999)

CONTENTS

Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV–X by Édith Nolot	I
The Sixty-four Destructions according to the <i>Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya</i> by Peter Skilling	113
Intermediate Existence and the Higher Fetters in the Pāli Nikāyas by G.A. Somaratne	121
Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the Related Literature by Junko Matsumura	155
An Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XXIV	173

Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV–X\*

To the memory of Édouard Burckard  
(1902–1998)

“Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms” (SVTT) III was concerned with *parivāsa* and *mānatta*, the specific penalties incurred by Buddhist monks or nuns who have committed a Saṃghādisesa (Saṃgh.) offence (that is, the second most serious type of offence listed in the Pātimokkha), and the only one in that list whose redress, dealt with in detail in the second and third *Khandhakas* of the Cullavagga, is said to entail formal procedures and constant supervision by a regular chapter. The present studies deal with other penalties which are related (whether they also involve procedures or not) both to each other and to those of *parivāsa* and *mānatta*: the group of seven other disciplinary procedures detailed in the first *Khandhaka* of the Cullavagga (SVTT IV); the contrasting terms *nissāraṇā*, *osāraṇā*, which must be investigated in connexion with those procedures (V); the penalties of expulsion (*nāsanā*) (VI) and “punishment” (*daṇḍa-kamma*) (VII); the disciplinary procedures of proclamation (*pakāsanīya-kamma*) (VIII) and of boycott of a lay donor’s gifts (*patta-nikkujjanā*) (IX); and the *brahma-daṇḍa* penalty (X).

An important correction to SVTT II 110, § 2c (iv) concerning *tassa-pāpiyyasikā*, will be found at the end of these studies (Appendix I) where it is referred to as *TPāp*. SVTT V and VI take into account a stimulating work on the same topics by Ven. Juo-hsüeh Shih (Oxford).

IV. The disciplinary procedures of *tajjanīya*-°, *nissaya*-°, *pabbājanīya*-°, *paṭisāraṇīya*-°, and threefold *ukkhepanīya-kamma* (n.)

I. The second and third chapters of the Cullavagga, where the particulars of the *mānatta* and *parivāsa* penalties are detailed, are preceded by the *Kamma-kkhandhaka* ("Section on procedures"),<sup>1</sup> which deals with a sevenfold set of similar disciplinary procedures,<sup>2</sup> there said to apply to offences that may be redressed by (mere) confession, i.e. neither Pārājika (Pār.) nor Saṃgh. offences.<sup>3</sup> According to Vin I 145,16–18, these penalties apply also to nuns.

A Skt Mū parallel occurs in the first part of the *Pāṇḍulohitaka-vastu*.<sup>4</sup> For a summary of Chinese data with references, see Frauwallner, *Vinaya* 107–109 (on Chinese and Skt parallels to *paṭisāraṇīya*, see also Lévi, "Mss sanscrits" 5–8).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Vin II 1,6–30,15 with Sp 1155,7–59,20.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. v.Hi., "Buddhist Law" pp. 20–21.

<sup>3</sup>Vin II 3,8–9,37 with Sp 1155,16–17. On the Pāc. offences that may or may not be redressed by confession (*desanā*-°, *adesanā-gāminī āpatti*), see SVTT II 112, n. 63.

<sup>4</sup>MSV(D) III 5,1–11,13 (*tarjanīyaṃ karma*), 11,14–15,19 (*nigarhaṇīyaṃ karma*), 15,20–19,8 (*pravāsanīyaṃ karma*), 19,9–28,6 (*pratisaṃharaṇīyaṃ karma*), 28,7–29,4 (*āpatter adarśanāyotkṣepaṇīyaṃ karma*), 29,4–30,2 (*āpatter apratikarmāyotkṣṇ*°), 30,3–32,12 (*apraṭi-niṣṭṣe pāpāke dṛṣṭigate utkṣṇ*°). For a summary of Tib. Mū, see Banerjee, SarvLit 224–27.

<sup>5</sup>None of these procedures is dealt with in ChinSp (where the parallel to the *Kamma-kkhandhaka* of the Cullavagga is missing), nor are they mentioned there according to the index. The *Campeyya-kkhandhaka* (Vin I 312–36), which deals extensively with the conditions of validity of these and other disciplinary procedures in the Thv(M) Vinaya (Vin) and immediately precedes ChinSp's parallel to the Cullavagga, is

Those seven procedures are: (I) *tajjanīya-kamma*, "blame";<sup>6</sup> (II) *nissaya-k*°, "dependence [on an adviser]"; (III) *pabbājanīya-k*°, "banishment [from one's residence]"; (IV) *paṭisāraṇīya-k*°, "summons to be reconciled [with a lay donor whom one has offended]";<sup>8</sup> and threefold *ukkhepanīya-k*°, "suspension": (V) for refusing to see one's offence (*āpattiyā adassane ukkh*°), (VI) for refusing to redress one's offence (*āpattiyā appaṭikamme ukkh*°),<sup>9</sup>

mentioned there only insofar as it "needs no explanation" (ChinSp 532 [14]).

<sup>6</sup>For convenience, terms occurring with variants *-i/-ī-* will be spelt henceforth in the latter form; those whose gender may be either neuter (n.) or feminine (f.) will be quoted as f.

<sup>7</sup>Most often replaced by *ni(y)as(s)a*, "disrepute", in Sp (E° and C°), Vjb (B°), and B° of Cullavagga (the heterogeneity of BHS parallel forms, listed at the end of this paragraph, should also be noted). This is not to be confused with the other senses of *nissaya*, masculine (m.) (no alternative spelling as far as can be seen): (i) "resources" upon which monks and nuns are ideally expected to rely (Vin I 58,10–22; II 274,23, 278,13–16); (ii) "dependence" of a newly ordained monk on his preceptor or instructor (Vin I 60,31–62,11), and revocation thereof (*nissaya-paṭippassaddhi*, Vin I 62,14; (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 9,16 *niṣṭṣaya-pratiprasrambhana* [Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 42,1 *niṣṭṣaya*-°]; cf. below, SVTT VII, § 4). – Cf. below, § 4 [g].

<sup>8</sup>The adjective *gihi-paṭisaṃyutta*, "connected with laymen", occurs solely in reference to this offence (Vin V 115,16 with Sp 1320,13–15); the sixth and seventh modes of settlement of formal disputes do not apply to it (cf. SVTT II 112., § 2d). The symmetrical case of a layman who offends monks is dealt with by the procedure of *patta-nikkujanā* (see below, SVTT IX).

<sup>9</sup>An illustration of an (objectionable) suspension of this kind occurs at Vin I 312,3–13,13; the text then states that groundless charges leading to suspension entail a Dukkata (Dukk.) offence (313,13–15,20, 322,34–25,25). – Skt Sa fragment with Chinese parallel: SHT(V) 36–38 (1049) and notes. – Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) II 199,4–201,13 (on the right readings, see below, second part of n. 28). – Chinese Mś parallel: Lévi-Chavannes, "Titres" 195–97.

(VII) for refusing to give up a wrong opinion<sup>10</sup> (*pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkh°*). Two of them, *pabbājanīya-k°* and *pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā ukkhepanīya-k°*, are also mentioned in the Bhikkhu- and Bhikkhunī-Vinaya-vibhaṅga; the *ukkhepanīya-k°* is referred to in the Bhikkhunī-Pātimokkha<sup>11</sup> (see below, §§ 7b, 8e).

<sup>10</sup>This doctrinal ground for an offence stands in striking contrast to the disciplinary grounds for all others (see Bechert, "Schismenedikt" pp. 33–34 = Bechert, Schulz 36). The penalty incurred by a novice in the same case is expulsion (*nāsanā*, Thv(M) [bhu] 70th Pāc.; see below, SVTT VI, § 2c). – According to Vin I 142,36–43,6 ≠ 144,30–36, a monk may (and should) break his monsoon retreat when a monk or a nun is to be dissuaded from advocating wrong opinions.

<sup>11</sup>The technical terms *tajjanīya*, *nissaya*, and *paṭisāraṇīya* are neither mentioned nor referred to in Pātim or in the *vibhaṅga*. The statement at SBE XVII 329, n. 4 (cf. Dutt, EBM, p. 15) that grounds quite similar to those for *tajjanīya* are dealt with in the 8th–11th Thv(M) [bhu] Saṃgh. (with the contradiction that the former is said, in canonical texts, not to apply to Saṃgh. offences) are based on the key-word *adhikaraṇa* that occurs both in the account of how and why *tajjanīya* was prescribed (see below, § 2 and n. 18), and in the wording of the 8th–11th Saṃgh. (Vin III 163,25\*\* with Kkh 43,27–28 ≠ Sp 595,11–12 [ChinSp 391–92 (56)]; Vin III 168,5\*\* with Kkh 44,24–45, 13, Sp 599,5–600,11; Vin III 172,32\*\* with Kkh 45,28–30 = Sp 607,32–608,2). Now, while there is most probably a historical relation between the earlier and later ways of coping with obstreperous monks (either by the *parivāsa/mānatta* penalties entailed by Saṃgh. offences, or by the ones studied here), and while the compilers of the Vinaya had as much reason to draw a formal connexion between the relevant Saṃgh. offences and the *tajjanīya* procedure as they had for connecting (as they actually did) the *pabbājanīya* procedure with the 13th Saṃgh. and the *ukkhepanīya* procedure with the 68th Pāc., no such connexion can be traced. There are only a number of scattered rules dealing with dissensions over procedure and the latter's validity in the *nidāna* of which the stock-phrase *bhaṇḍana-kāraka*, etc. (as below, n. 18) often recurs (e.g., in the 53rd bhikkhunī [bhī] Pāc., Vin IV 309,25–28; cf. below, § 6c). There are some exceptions (e.g., in the 63th bhikkhu [bhu] Pāc., which deals with the irregular reopening [*ukkoṭana*] of a settled dispute; see SVTT II 93 and n. 9).

I. BHS *tarjanīya*, n. : Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,3.

*Skt tarjanīya*, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,5 (°-arha), III 5,2\*; Mvy 8642. – (unidentified school) SHT(V) 116 (1121, B1) (°-arha).

*tarjanīyaṃ karma*: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13, III 5,14ff. – (Mū?)<sup>12</sup> SHT(V) 103–104 (1108, r° 4, v° 1)

*tarjanīya-karma*, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 23, 24, 28; MSV(D) II 208,9f. (°-arha), III 7,4f. (°-kṛta).

II. BHS *nigarhaṇīya*, n., "subduing": Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,3.

*Skt nigarhaṇa*, n., "condemnation": (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,3.

*nigarhaṇīya*, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,8, III 5,2\*; Mvy 8643.

*nigarhaṇīyaṃ karma*, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13, 208,10–11, III 12,2ff.

*nigarhaṇīya-karma*, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,13–14 (°-arha), 15 (twice, once °-arha), III 13,10ff. (°-kṛta).

*niśrāyaṇīya*, "dependance": (Sa?)<sup>13</sup> SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v° 4).

*vigarhaṇīya*, "rebuke": (Sa or Mū) SHT(VI) 111 (1388, v° 5).

III. BHS *pravṛjanīya*, n. : Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,4.

*Skt pravāsa*, m., "sending away": (Mū) MSV(D) III 5,3\*.

*pravāsana*, n. : (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,4.

<sup>12</sup>*A-vastukaṃ* (r° 5), *sa-v°* (v° 1), are part of the Mū terminology (see below, second part of n. 28); so is *sthalastha* (v° 3–4; see SVTT I 91, n. 41).

<sup>13</sup>See SVTT II 111, n. 62.

*pravāsaṇīya*, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13;<sup>14</sup> Mvy 8644.  
*pravāsaṇīyaṃ karma*, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,16f., III 18,19ff.  
*pravāsaṇīya-karma* : (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,16f. (°-arha).  
*pravāhaṇīya*, n., “dismissal” : (Sa?)<sup>14</sup> SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v° 4).

IV. **BHS** *pratisāraṇīya*, n. : Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,4. – *grhinām aprasāde pratisāraṇīya karma*, n. : (prob. Mā or Mā-L) Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 8 (5b3, b4, b10).

**Skt** *pratisaṃharaṇa*, n., “withdrawal (of offending behaviour)” : (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,5, 103,17–18.

*prati-saṃharaṇīya*, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,11, III 25,10f., 26,6–7f.; Mvy 8645. – (Sa?)<sup>14</sup> : SHT(V) 47 (1057a, v° 5). – Cf. (unidentified school) SHT(V) 116 (1121, B2) *pratisaṃhara*. +++//

*prati-saṃharaṇīyaṃ karma*, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,13, 208,14f., III 25,10ff.

*prati-saṃharaṇīya-karma* : (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,18f. (°-arha), III 25,9f. (°-kṛta).

V. **BHS** *āpattīya adarśanena utkṣepaṇīyaṃ* [misprinted °nī°] *karma*, n. : BhīVin(Mā-L) 97,5 (cf. 144,14).

**Skt** *adarśanāyotkṣipta*, m(f). : (Sa) SHT(V) 37–38 (1049, v° 2 [v° 3 °nīyotkṣ°]). – °taka, m(f). : (Mū) KC, Kaṭh-v 56,2 (≠ MSV(D) II 157,18); Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 34,3 (= MSV(D) IV 65,20–21), 34,10 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 705 [52, v° 8] = MSV(D) IV 66,6–7); MSV(D) III 70,11. – °takatva, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) III 69,6.

<sup>14</sup>Omitted in MSV(D) after *nigarhaṇīyaṃ*; see GBM (FacEd) X.6, 887 (187, v° 1).

*adarśanāyotkṣepaṇīyakarmârha* : MSV(D) II 208,22 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 887 [187, v° 9] for ed. *adarśaṇīyotkṣ°*).

*adarśanāyotkṣepaṇīyaṃ karma* : (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,18–19 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 887 [187, v° 8–9] for ed. *adarśaṇīyotkṣ°*), III 28,10ff.

*adarśa[nā][?yo]tkṣepaṇīyaṃ karmârha* : MSV(D) II 208,20 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 887 [187, v° 9]).

*āpatter adarśanād utkṣepaṇīya* : (unidentified school) SHT(VI) 77 (1314, A5). – *ā° a° °nīyaṃ karma*, n. : (Mū) MSV(D) III 28,12.

VI. **BHS** *āpattīya apratikarmeṇa utkṣipta* : BhīVin(Mā-L) 99,14 (144,14 °dharmeṇa).

**Skt** *apratikarmârḥāyotkṣepaṇīya* (with °karmârḥāyotkṣ° short for °karmāyotkṣepaṇīyakarmârḥāyotkṣ°) : (Mū) MSV(D) II 208,21.

(*āpatter*) *apratikarmanāyotkṣiptaka*, m(f). : (Mū) KC, Kaṭh-v 56,2 (≠ MSV(D) II 157,18–19); Lévi, “Mss sanscrits” 34,11 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 705 [52, v° 8–9]) ≠ MSV(D) IV 66,7; MSV(D) III 70,12 (so read with GBM(FacEd) X.6, 922 [205, r° 1]).

*āpatter apratikarmāyotkṣepaṇīyaṃ karma* : (Mū) MSV(D) III 29,10f. (29,8 °karmanāyotkṣ°, so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 900 [194, r° 9]).

VII-A. **BHS** *trayānām<sup>15</sup> drṣṭigatānām apratiniḥsargeṇa utkṣipta* : BhīVin(Mā-L) 99,14–15 (cf. 144,14–15).

*pāpikāṃ drṣṭim apratinissaranta*, m(f). : PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,27.

**Skt** *apratiniḥsṛṣṭe pāpake drṣṭigate utkṣiptaka* : (Mū) KC, Kaṭh-v 56,3 (= MSV(D) II 157,19). – °takatva, n. :

<sup>15</sup>On the three kinds of wrong views according to the Mā(-L) tradition, see Nolot, “Règles” p. 83, n. 73.

(Mū) MSV(D) III 69,6, 70,11 (ed. wrongly °*nīsr̥ṣṭe*; see GBM(FacEd) X.6, 921 [204, v° 3-4], 922 [205, r° 1]).

*a° p° d° utkṣepañīyaṃ karma*, n.: (Mū) MSV(D) II 209,5-8 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6,888 [188, r° 1]).

*apratinīsr̥ṣṭe pāpake dr̥ṣṭigate utkṣepañīyaṃ karma*: (Mū) MSV(D) III 30,8-9ff. – *a° p° d° °ñīyaṃ karma-kṛta* 31,8ff. (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 901 [194, v° 10], 902 [195, r° 3-6]).

*adarśanāyotkṣepañīyaṃ apratikarmāyotk° apratinīsr̥ṣṭe pāpake dr̥ṣṭigate utkṣepañīyaṃ karma*: MSV(D) II 207,13-15 (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 887 [187, v° 1-2]). – the second sequence with *apratikarmāyotkṣepañīya-karmārha* *ib.*, v° 10 (ed. 209,3, 4 °*karmārhayotkṣepañīyakarmārha*). – the third one *ib.* v° 10 (≠ MSV(D) II 209,2 °*nīsr̥ṣṭe*).

*adarśanāyotkṣepakatva, apratikarmāyotkṣ°, apratinīsr̥ṣṭe pāpake dr̥ṣṭigate utkṣ°*: (Mū) MSV(D) III 67,11-12 (so also GBM(FacEd) X.6, 920 [204, r° 5]); all to be corrected to *utkṣiptakatva* according to BHSD s.v. *utkṣiptaka*).

Cf. (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,6-8 *āpattāv apratikṛtāyām apratikāryāyām saṃvarenādr̥ṣṭim udbhāvayantam anicchantaṃ pratikṛtim anuṣṭhātum anutsr̥jantaṃ ca pāpikāṃ dr̥ṣṭim utkṣipeyuh*.

VII-B. BHS *utkṣipta*, m(f): BhīVin(Mā-L) 97,8 (misprinted °*ksi°*)ff., 144,3ff.; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,26. – *utkṣiptaka*, m(f): BhīVin(Mā-L) 163,37; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 5,4.

*utkṣepaṇa-pācattika*: PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,25.

*utkṣepañīya-karma*, n.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 143,3, 19 (so ms.). – °*ñīyaṃ karma*: BhīVin(Mā-L) 97,6, 143,4f., 151,9, 312,2; Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,6 (misprinted °*ni°*).

Skt *utkṣipta*, m.: (Sa) PrMoSū 260 (HL, v° 2). – (Mū) MSV(D) II 190,16f., 192,13f., 194,3, III 69,21.

*utkṣiptaka*, m(f): (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 103,4; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 55,21; MSV(D) II 113,15ff., 154,15 (= KC, Kath-v 53,28), 176,7ff., 178,5ff., 190,13ff., 194,4f., IV 250,4f. (= Saṅghabh II 272,12f.).

*utkṣepaka*, m(f): (Mū) MSV(D) II 176,16ff., 179,15, 191,7f., IV 250,9f. (= Saṅghabh II 272,14f.).

*utkṣepañīyaṃ karma*, n.: (Sa?)<sup>16</sup> SHT(V) 47.(1057a, v° 2, v° 3). – (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 267,14-15, 268,6; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 55,23; MSV(D) II 176,4, 201,13, 202,6.

*utkṣepañīya*, n.: Mvy 8646.

*utkṣepañīya-karma*, n.: (Sa) Hoernle, MR 12, v° 1. – (Mū) Adhik-v 103,13, 104,3f.; BhīKaVā(S) 267,14-15, 268,5-6; MSV(D) II 209,1, 210,17, IV 27,11. – *utkṣepañī-karma*: (Sa?)<sup>16</sup> SHT(V) 46 (1057a, v° 1).

2. According to the account in the Cullavagga of the circumstances which are said to have led to the prescription of these disciplinary procedures, *tajjanīya* applies especially to quarrelsome monks;<sup>17</sup> *nissaya* to unskilled ones who repeatedly commit Saṅgh. offences and who mix unbecomingly with lay people;<sup>18</sup> *pabbājanīya* to those who create a

<sup>16</sup>See SVTT II III, n. 62.

<sup>17</sup>This is expressed by the stock phrase *bhaṇḍana-kārakā kalaha-k° vivāda-k° bhassa-k° saṃghe adhikaraṇa-k°*, "they raise quarrels, strife, dissensions; they raise disputes among the chapter" (Vin II 1,8-10 = I 328,25-27). – Cf. (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,3 *kalaha-kāraka[m] tarjayeyuh* [so read] *karmaṇā*.

<sup>18</sup>This is expressed by the stock phrase *bālo hoti avyatto āpatti-bahulo anapadāno gihi-saṃsaṅghe viharati ananulomikehi gihi-saṃsaggehi*, "he is unskilled, incompetent, ridden with offences, unable to discern them: he associates unbecomingly with lay people" (Vin II 7,17-19 = I 330,4-6). Contrary to what is stated in SBE XVII 343 n. 1, 384 n. 1 (cf. BD V 11 n. 3), followed by me in SVTT III 131, § 4c, what is meant in the next sentence is quite clearly the *repeated* commission of offences that *all* belong to the Saṅgh. category (Vin II 7,19-21 *api 'ssu bhikkhū pakatā parivāsaṃ dentā mūlāya paṭikassantā mānattaṃ dentā abbhentā*:

scandal by their immoral behaviour and to those who corrupt lay people's minds;<sup>19</sup> *paṭisāraṇīya* to those who scoff and jeer at faithful, generous lay followers;<sup>20</sup> *ukkhepanīya* to those who refuse either to see or to redress an offence, or who refuse to give up a wrong opinion.<sup>21</sup>

3. As in the case of *parivāsa* and *mānatta*, all the procedures by which the penalties are to be inflicted, then can-

"Moreover, the monks kept granting him probation, sending him to the beginning, granting him re-admission" [BD V 11 (see *ib.* n. 2) translates *pakatā* by "were done up with"; Sp 1157,21-22, however, glosses the term by *nicca-byāvaṭā*). The Saṃgh. offences are indeed mentioned explicitly in the Skt and Tib. Mū parallels (MSV(D) III 11,15-16; Banerjee, SarvLit 224-25).

<sup>19</sup>This is expressed by the stock phrase *ime ... bhikkhū kula-dūsakā pāpasamācārā, imesaṃ pāpakā samācarā dissanti c' eva suyanti ca kulāni ca imehi duṭṭhāni dissanti c' eva suyanti ca*, "these monks corrupt the laity, they behave immorally; their immoral behaviour is both to be seen and heard, and so are the lay people they have corrupted" (Vin II 13,3-6 = I 330,16-19). This stock phrase is extracted from the *sikkhāpada* of the Thv(M) 13th [bhu] Saṃgh. (Vin III 184,9-12\*\*f.; see below, § 7b).

<sup>20</sup>This is expressed by the stock phrase *kathaṃ ... tvaṃ ... gahapatim saddhaṃ pasannaṃ dāyakaṃ kāraṃ saṃgh' upaṭṭhāhakaṃ hīnena khumsessasi hīnena vambhessasi*, "how can you jeer and scoff at a faithful, believing householder who makes gifts, who is active, who supports the community?" (Vin II 18,4-7 f.), or *bhikkhu gihī akkosati paribhāsati*, "a monk abuses and reviles laymen" (Vin I 330,22-23), or *upāsake saddhe pasanne akkosati paribhāsati appasādaṃ karoti*, "he abuses, reviles, spoils the faith of, believing and faithful lay followers" (Vin II 295,2-7, in a debatable procedure).

<sup>21</sup>This is expressed by the stock phrases *āpattim āpajjitvā na icchati āpattim passitum*, "although he has committed an offence, he refuses to see it" (Vin II 21,8 f. = I 330,28-29); *āpattim āpajjitvā na icchati āpattim paṭikātum*, "although he has committed an offence, he refuses to redress it" (Vin II 25,3 = I 330,35); *bhikkhuno ... evarūpaṃ pāpikaṃ diṭṭhigataṃ uppannaṃ ... so taṃ diṭṭhiṃ na paṭinissajjati*, "a monk has formed this kind of wrong opinion ... and does not give it up" (Vin II 26,38-27,2), or *bhikkhu na icchati pāpikaṃ diṭṭhiṃ paṭinissajjitum*, "a monk refuses to give up a wrong opinion" (Vin I 331,3-4).

celled, are of the most elaborate, fourfold type.<sup>22</sup> They may be considered as valid, and the matter as settled, only if each of the following conditions is fulfilled:<sup>23</sup> participation (*sammukhā*)<sup>24</sup> of a regular chapter including the required quorum of (four) monks, conformity to rules and to monastic discipline, and participation of the guilty monk in person; due inquiry (*paṭipucchā*) into the case; acknowledgement (*paṭiññā*)<sup>25</sup> of his offence by the monk; reality of an offence that may be, but is not yet, redressed by confession;<sup>26</sup> due reproof (*codetvā*) of the guilty monk after inquiry; then reminding (*sāretvā*) him of his offence and charging (*ropetvā*) him with it.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup>See SVTT I 84-85, § 3d. An exception is, in the Skt Mū parallel at MSV(D) III 26,1-10, the onefold *jñapti-karma* by which the *pratisamharaṇīya-karma* is to be revoked.

<sup>23</sup>Vin II 2,20-4,15 (*tajjanīya*), 8,2-22 (*nissaya*), 12,37-13,23 (*pabbājanīya*), 18,11-32 (*paṭisāraṇīya*), 21,22-22,9 (*āpattiyā adassane ukkhepanīya*), 25,4-5 (*ā° appaṭikamme ukkh°*), 26,34-27,21 (*pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkh°*).

Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 5,15-7,3 (*tarjanīya*), 12,4-13,9 (*nigarhaṇīya*), 18,18-19,8 (*pravāsaṇīya*), 24,12-25,8 (*pratisamharaṇīya*), 28,12-29,3 (*āpatter adarśane ukkhepanīya* [the procedure however includes the formula *yathā dharmam na pratikaroti*, which strictly speaking belongs to the next kind of *ukkhepanīya*]), 29,10-30,2 (*ā° apratikarmāyōtkṣ°*), 30,11-31,6 (*apratinissagge pāpake dṛṣṭigate utkṣ°*).

<sup>24</sup>Cf. SVTT II 99-101, § 2 a and n. 29.

<sup>25</sup>See SVTT II 113, n. 64; on these first three provisions, see also Vin I 325,26-326,31.

<sup>26</sup>This provision contradicts the technical interpretation of the statement that the penalties dealt with here apply to monks who stray from morality (*sīla-vipanna*), *i.e.*, those guilty of a Saṃgh. offence, which may not be redressed by (mere) confession (see above, § 1, and SVTT II 97, n. 19, 112, n. 63). As to how Vjb solves this contradiction, see below, n. 47.

<sup>27</sup>Urging a monk to acknowledge his offence also includes asking his permission (*okāsaṃ kārapetvā*) to talk to him about it (see SVTT III 121, n. 16); this stage is not mentioned here, but is prescribed at Sp



The importance of the right performance of these procedures (*cf.* SVTT I 75–78, §§ 1–2) is further stressed at Vin I 328,25–33,31, which deals at length with each possible ground for formal invalidity, and the disputes that may ensue among the community.

4. There are several differences between these and the *mānatta/parivāsa* procedures, and the penalties entailed.

(a) The range of application of the procedures dealt with here is greater, but they do not, according to the Cullavagga, apply to the *unrepeated* commission (see above, n. 19) of Saṃgh. offences ;

(b) no distinction is made between cases when the offence was concealed and when it was not;<sup>28</sup>

(c) unlike the proceedings applying to Saṃgh. offences of the *yāva-tatiyaṃ* sub-class (see below, SVTT X n. 10), no standard (formal or informal) threefold admonition of a

624,7–17, among the proceedings preliminary to a *pabbājanīya-kamma*, which may not, as stressed by *Sp ib.*, be carried out without acknowledgement (*paṭiññā*) of his offence by the guilty monk. These proceedings apply to all and any disciplinary procedures, except, according to a late, sub-commentarial statement, to that of *brahma-daṇḍa* (see below, SVTT X, § 2 c).

As for the Tib. Mū parallel, Banerjee, SarvLit 227 wrongly paraphrases *khas-blans*, “acknowledgement”, by “a competent monk should acquaint the Saṅgha about the offence”; the Tibetan term actually corresponds to Pāli *paṭiññā*, Skt *pratijñā* (Mvy 8637). The latter occurs at MSV(D) II 201,12–13 = 202,5–6, 9–10: *tais tasya acodayitvā asmārayitvā avastukam apratijñāyā balād utkṣepaṇiyaṃ karma kṛtaṃ* (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 884 [186, r° 3, r° 6, r° 7]); the editor’s readings, *tasyācodayitvāsmārayitvā vastukarma-pratijñāyā*, make no sense; neither does the misreading *vyagreṇa* for *dyāgreṇa* at 202,9). At MSV(D) III 5,17, 6,1, 12,6,9, *avastukam apratijñāyā* should read *°jñāyā* (so GBM(FacEd) X.6, 889 [188, v° 5, v° 6], 892 [190, r° 6, r° 7]). – *Cf.* above, n. 13.

<sup>28</sup>Possibly, as O. von Hinüber has suggested to me, because the offences concerned here are, by their very nature, “public”, and therefore “technically impossible” to conceal.

monk takes place here before he is officially sentenced as guilty ;

(d) this monk is not expected to make a formal, threefold application before the chapter for the penalty he incurs, which is not “granted” (*dinna*) to him, but “proceeded to” (*kata*) against him.<sup>29</sup> Accordingly, whereas the stress there is on the willingness of a monk guilty of a Saṃgh. offence to apply to the chapter (*saṃgho icchitabbo*) for redress (*vuṭṭhātu-kāma*),<sup>30</sup> what is stressed here is self-submission: a monk undergoing any of the seven penalties dealt with here is expected to “duly observe the restrictions to his rights, behave with subdued manners, and follow the course leading to release” from both his offence and the penalty entailed;<sup>31</sup> only then may he make a formal, threefold application to the chapter in these very same terms (to be repeated by the chairman) for the cancellation of the penalty;<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup>Compare Vin II 38,12–39,14 (*cf.* SVTT III 117–118, § 1) with 2,20–23ff. (complete references as above, n. 24).

<sup>30</sup>See SVTT III 117–118, n. 7. As suggested to me by R.F. Gombrich, the expected eagerness of a guilty monk to apply for the *mānatta* penalty might give a clue as to the etymology of the latter term (*cf.* SVTT III. 117 n. 6, where the references to the traditional etymology quoted or referred to are all post-canonical except the (Sa) PrMoSū): Skt *māna*, “self-attribution” (*cf.* *x-mānin*, “attributing to oneself the quality of *x*”) + *tva*.

In post-canonical literature at least, as far as lexicographical tools allow checking, (*v*)*uṭṭhāna-gāminī āpatti* refers regularly to *saṃghādisesa* (e.g., Sp 236,32–33, 584,5–6, 873,29, 877,7, 989,30, 1319,24, 1353,16–17; Vin-vn 3103). *Cf.* below, *TPāp* n. 20.

<sup>31</sup>*°kammakatā sammā-vattanti lomam pātentī netthāram vattanti* (Vin II 5,18–19ff.). Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 7,14–17, 13,16–19, 25,12–15, 31,8–10.

<sup>32</sup>This is not so in the Skt Mū parallel, which distinguishes, in its account of *tarjanīya*, between the restrictions to be observed when undergoing the penalty (MSV(D) III 7,5–11; see below, *TPāp* n. 22), and the conditions under which the monk may be restored (*osārita*; *cf.* below, n. 36) to full status. Besides submissive behaviour, these specific

(e) except in the case of suspension, the penalties dealt with here are lighter than *parivāsa* and *mānatta*: in particular, they include neither constant control by a regular chapter, nor informing each and every monk about one's status, nor restrictions on moving alone freely;

conditions are (III 7,20-9,14; cf. BhīKaVā(S) 267,16-18, with Chinese and Tib. Mū parallels in BhīPr 81-83): standing within the boundary (*sīmā*) when one applies for restoration (see below, n. 100, and SVTT V n. 31); stating formally that one gives up the misbehaviour for which one was sentenced; relying neither on the king's household, nor on a *yuktakula* [?] (also Guṇ-VinSū 101,30), nor on non-Buddhist ascetics, nor on an individual, but on the Saṃgha exclusively; dressing neither like laymen nor like non-Buddhist ascetics; abstaining from following the latter, and from misbehaving; observing the monks' training; abstaining from reviling or abusing them, and from wishing for losses to the Saṃgha (cf. the restrictions said to be entailed by suspension in Thv(M) texts, below § 8 a).

As for restoration after *nigarhaṇīya*, the fivefold, specific conditions are just those of submissive behaviour, together with standing within the boundary, and stating formally that one gives up one's misbehaviour (14,2-4).

As for *pravāsaṇīya*, the text is so abridged that neither the restrictions to the sentenced monk's rights nor the conditions for his restoration are listed (18,18-19,8).

As for *pratisaṃharaṇīya*, the restrictions seem to be identical with those applying to *tarjanīya* (25,9-11); the fivefold conditions for restoration are identical with those applying in case of *nigarhaṇīya* (25,19-21).

As for the threefold *utkṣepaṇīya*, the restrictions and the conditions for restoration are said to be identical with those applying in case of *tarjanīya* (29,3-4, 30,1-2, 31,6-7, 14-16). — Here, unlike what is prescribed in the Cullavagga, the conditions for restoration applying to the cases of *both tarjanīya* and threefold *utkṣepaṇīya* (see below, end of § 8 a) are more severe than those applying in case of *nigarhaṇīya*, *pravāsaṇīya*, and *pratisaṃharaṇīya*.

(f) the duration of these penalties is not fixed in advance,<sup>33</sup> but depends on the monk's manifest self-submission and his explicit acknowledgement of it in the terms quoted above (d);<sup>34</sup>

(g) in the *Kamma-kkhandhaka* of the Cullavagga, the procedure by which the penalty is eventually cancelled is simply termed "cancellation" (*paṭippassaddhi*) in all cases,<sup>35</sup> and may be carried out by the smallest chapter (of four monks), in contrast to the one that applies to the redress of Saṃgh. offences, which requires the biggest quorum of monks (twenty) and is designated by the specific term *abbhāna*, "readmission" (see SVTT III 133-35, § 6).

5a. The rights of a monk subjected to a *tajjanīya* procedure are curtailed according to eighteen prescriptions that also apply partly to *parivāsa* and *mānatta*:<sup>36</sup> he should not grant ordination, give guidance to newly ordained monks,

<sup>33</sup>Cf. SVTT III 119ff., § 1a, 2ff. Sp 1157,18-20 states that the penalties dealt with here should last ten or twenty (so E<sup>c</sup>; Bp, and C<sup>c</sup> (SHB 1948) 858,15: "or five") days.

<sup>34</sup>*Tajjanīya-kamassa* [etc.] *paṭippassaddhiyā sammā-vattanā ādi* (Vin V 142,31-36). See also Vin V 182,34-183,10, with Sp 1371,27-29 (reading logically *anulomavatte na* [C<sup>c</sup> (SHB 1948) 1018,10-11 *anulomavatte* (line 11) *na* is inconclusive, since a word printed over two successive lines is never hyphenated in this edition]). Sp's *prima facie* metaphorical statement that if the sentenced monk does not behave properly, *sa-rājjuko 'va vissajjetabbo*, is not clear to me.

<sup>35</sup>Vin II 6,26-7,15 (*tajjanīya*), 9,4-27 (*nissaya*), 15,6-27 (*pabbājanīya*), 21,1-3 (*paṭisāraṇīya*), 24,29-33, 25,5-7, 28,12-17 (threefold *ukkhepanīya*). On the twofold technical sense of *nissaya-paṭippassaddhi*, see above, n. 8. Outside the *Kamma-kkhandhaka*, the term *osāraṇā*, "restoration", often refers specifically to the cancellation of suspension (see below, SVTT V, § 6 b) — unlike its SktMū parallel, which reads consistently *osāraṇā* here in all cases (MSV(D) III 9,15-11,3 [*tarjanīya*], 14,5-15,9 [*nigarhaṇīya*], [the restoration after *pravāsaṇīya* is not mentioned], 26,1-10 [*pratisaṃharaṇīya*, a *jñāpti-karma*], 31,16-32,12 [third *utkṣepaṇīya*: the restoration after the first two is not dealt with]).

<sup>36</sup>See SVTT III 119-21, § 1a.

be waited upon by novices, be appointed as exhorter of nuns or exhort them if appointed before he became liable to this procedure, commit again the same, or a similar, or a graver offence, criticize either the procedure or those who carried it out, suspend (on account of some irregularity) the participation of a regular monk in the ceremonies of either *uposatha* or *pavāraṇā*, issue commands, exercise authority, urge a monk to acknowledge an offence, or quarrel with other monks.<sup>37</sup>

5b. The restrictions imposed by *nissaya*, *pabbājanīya* and *paṭisāraṇīya* are the same,<sup>38</sup> but each include a further, specific clause that occurs first (except for *pabbājanīya*) in the account of how the Buddha is said to have prescribed it, then consistently as a formula to be uttered by the chairman during the procedure. These are respectively :

(a) *nissāya te vatthabbam*, “you must live in dependence [on an adviser]”; the sentenced monk is thereby expected to seek advice from learned monks, until he acquires a sound knowledge of doctrine and discipline, and proves able to act with discretion;<sup>39</sup>

(b) *na [itthan-nāmehi] bhikkhūhi [itthan-nāmasmim āvāse] vatthabbam*, “the monks [So-and-So] must leave [their residence in X]”;<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup>Vin II 5,5-16 (*tajjanīya*) (= 32,2-11 about *parivāsa*, with Sp 1155,23-56,14, 1157,13-14, the latter referring to 1162,1-63,22). – Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 7,4-13.

<sup>38</sup>Vin II 8,20-23 (*nissaya*) = 14,7-9 (*pabbājanīya*) = 19,18-19 (*paṭisāraṇīya*). – Skt Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 13,10-15; summary of Tib. Mū parallels: Banerjee, SarvLit 227.

<sup>39</sup>Vin II 8,1-2, 5-7 f., 25-30.

<sup>40</sup>Vin II 13,8-9f. Contrary to what is implied by Hüsken, “Stock” 214-15 (§ 8), there is no indication that a monk sentenced to *pabbājanīya* should leave his residence *alone*.

(c) [*itthan-nāmo*] *te gahapati khamāpetabbo*, “you must ask the layman [So-and-So] to forgive you”;<sup>41</sup> the monk is thereby requested to apologize to the offended lay donor, and should observe the prescribed restrictions until he does. When held back by shame from apologizing, he may be accompanied by a mediator monk, duly appointed to this office by a twofold procedure (*cf.* Vin II 295,7-18). If the offended party refuses the offender’s apologies; the mediator is to plead for forgiveness first in the offender’s, then in the monastic community’s name; then, if unsuccessful, to make the offender confess his offence within eye- and ear-shot of the former.<sup>42</sup>

5c. The restrictions imposed by *ukkhepanīya* are much more severe (see below, § 8a); both the wording of the rule attributed to the Buddha and the procedure include the specific formula that epitomizes them: *a-sambhogam saṃghena*, “[suspension] involving suppression of dealings with the community”.<sup>43</sup>

6a. Although the narratives and descriptions of procedures in the Cullavagga point to the application of one

<sup>41</sup>Vin II 18,9-11, 18-19f. Only here does a corresponding formula occur in the Skt Mū procedure (MSV(D) III 26,10-11 *gaccha taṃ gṛhapatim kṣamaya*).

<sup>42</sup>Vin II 19,21-20,22 *āpatti desāpetabbā* (DEBMT 132 “admonish the guilty monk” is wrong). One might argue (as I did) that, according to Vin IV 32,11-12, disclosing to laymen a minor offence (*a-duṭṭhullā āpatti*) committed by another monk entails a Dukk. offence, unless the Saṃgha moves a formal agreement to do so (for complete references, see below, SVTT VIII n. 8). Here, however, the monk who committed an offence discloses it himself, be it willy-nilly or under the control of a “mediator” monk whose job is to enforce the Saṃgha’s benevolent policy (be it by formal or informal agreement) towards lay donors. I owe the core of this piece of casuistry, for whose elaboration I am solely responsible, to O. von Hinüber.

<sup>43</sup>Vin II 21, 21-22, 28-29f., 25,2-7 (truncated E<sup>c</sup>), 26,30-34, 27,3-5f. See below, § 8 b.

specific penalty to one specific type of misbehaviour, the same text goes on to state that a strict correspondence between the two is not a *sine qua non* condition of validity for the procedures entailed: any of the seven procedures except the fourth<sup>44</sup> may be carried out against five types of monks:

- (i) quarrelsome ones who foster disputes (*adhikaraṇa*)<sup>45</sup> among the chapter;
- (ii) inexperienced ones who constantly commit offences that they are unable even to discern;
- (iii) those who mix unbecomingly with lay people;
- (iv) those who stray from morality, right behaviour, or right opinions;<sup>46</sup>
- (v) those who disparage the Buddha, the doctrine, or the monastic community.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup>Cf. Sp I 158.18 [*paṭisāraṇiyāraho bhikkhu*] *aṅga-samannāgato purimehi asadiso*.

<sup>45</sup>See SVTT II.

<sup>46</sup>*Sīla*-°, *ācāra*-°, *diṭṭhi-vipatti*; see SVTT II 97, n. 19 (add to the references given there Sp 588.21-27 [ChinSp 389 (48)], 1413.32-14.2, Vin-vn 3103-106; cf. BD II 221 n. 1). Vjb 507.9-508.9 solves the technical inconsistency resulting from *sīla-vipatti* = Pār. or Saṃgh. (to which, according to canonical texts, the penalties dealt with here do not apply: see above, § 3 and n. 27) as follows (full text at the end of this paper, in Appendix II): if a monk strays from morality, the chapter may choose not to charge him with a Saṃgh. but to stress another aspect of his misbehaviour, and to carry out the relevant procedure. Although the technical definitions of both *sīla-vipatti* and *adesanā-gāminī āpatti* include the Pār. as well as the Saṃgh. offences, what is implied here is, according to Vjb, the Saṃgh. class; the Pār. are mentioned only for the sake of completeness (on the application of this restriction to two synonyms of *adesanā-gāminī āpatti*, see SVTT III 132, n. 48 [*duṭṭhullā āpatti*]; Nolot, "Règles" 401-404 with SVTT III 135, n. 52 [*garukā āpatti*]).

<sup>47</sup>Vin II 4.17-5.3 (*tajjanīya*), 8.20-23 (*nissaya*), 22.7-9, 25.1-7, 27.19-21 (threefold *ukkhepanīya*). The corresponding penalty for novices who disparage them is expulsion (*nāsanā*; see below, SVTT VI, § 2 a-b).

*Pabbājanīya* applies to the same and, more specifically, to frivolous monks, to those whose bad behaviour and lack of training bring the Pātimokkha rules to naught, and to those whose means of livelihood are corrupt (Vin II 13.23-14.16 with Sp I 157.26-58.5).

*Paṭisāraṇīya* does not apply to the above types, but is restricted to monks who cause losses to lay people, or who abuse them, or who foster quarrels among them,<sup>48</sup> or who speak ill of the Buddha, the doctrine or the monastic community in their presence,<sup>49</sup> or who scoff and jeer at them, or who are not true to their promises to them.<sup>50</sup>

6b. Now, as discussed at Sp I 156.13-57.13, although carrying out one procedure against a monk who is actually liable to another procedure is said to invalidate the former,<sup>51</sup> this provision does not apply here: invalidation ensues only if the chapter chooses one specific procedure (whereupon the monk becomes *ipso facto* liable to it (°-*kammāraha*)) then

<sup>48</sup>These are, *mutatis mutandis*, the same grounds as those on which a *daṇḍa-kamma* penalty is to be inflicted on novices who cause losses, etc., to the monks (Vin I 84.9-13), and on monks who cause losses, etc., to the nuns (see below, SVTT VII, § § 2-3).

<sup>49</sup>These and the former grounds are the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as those on which a *pattanikkujjana-kamma* is to be carried out against lay followers who do not respect monks (Vin II 125.12-20; see below, SVTT IX).

<sup>50</sup>Vin II 18.33-19.16 with Sp I 158.22-29. These five applications are further systematized, now including *paṭisāraṇīya*, by triads at Vin V 121.24-122.26 with Sp 1327.10-28.1. Vin V 122.7-10 adds a sixth possibility: the chapter may "contemplate making [the penalty] more stringent" (*āgāḥāya ceteyya*; cf. v.Hi., "Kasussyntax" § 176) for the same five types of monks; according to Sp 1327.10-13, this means that when the prescribed penalty is not observed properly, the chapter may decide to carry out a procedure of suspension, presumably for refusing to redress one's offence (cf. below, § 6c; on the greater severity of the penalty entailed by *ukkhepanīya*, see below, § § 8 a-b).

<sup>51</sup>Vin I 325.32-28.23 (Sp I 156.18-22 refers to Vin I 327.1-24).

carries out another one.<sup>52</sup> According to Sp 1292,9–12 (*ad* Vin II 261,12–14, and quoting Vin I 327,2–3), the same applies to nuns acting in chapter, after the monks have stated which procedure the latter should carry out (*cf.* SVTT II 94, end of n. 10).

This explanation brings to attention the phrase *ākaṅkhamāno saṃgho*, “the chapter may choose [this or that among the six (Cullavagga) or seven (Parivāra, as above, n. 51) procedures]”, that recurs again and again in this context and contrasts with *kammaṃ kātabbhaṃ*, “a [disciplinary] procedure must be carried out”, at Vin V 122,10–26<sup>53</sup>: whichever

<sup>52</sup>*Yadā saṃghena sannipativā idaṃ nāma imassa bhikkhuno kammaṃ kāromā ti sannipāhānaṃ kataṃ hoti, tadā so kammāraho nāma hoti, tasmā iminā lakkaṇaṇa tajjanīyādi-kammārahassa niyasa-kammādi-karaṇaṃ* [for *nissaya*-°; see above, n. 8] *adhamma-kammaṃ c’ eva avinaya-kammaṃ cā ti vedītabbhaṃ* (Sp 1156,26–57,2; *cf.* Vmv II 205,26–206,7). As Vjb 507,15 puts it, “what is to be considered here is the intention of the agent [of the procedure, *i.e.*, the chapter]” (*kattu adhippāyo ettha cintetabbo*; see Appendix II, at the end of this paper). See also Sp 1147,7–22 (with Sp-† III 346,24–47,14, Vmv II 205,26–206,7) *ad* Vin I 321,29–22,4: even though the specific ground (*i.e.*, *kula-dūsaka*: see above, § 2 and n. 20) for dismissing a monk (*nissāraṇā*; see below, SVTT V, § 6a) by a *pabbājanīya-kamma* is missing, and the guilty monk is described instead as *bālo avyatto ... gihi-saṃsaggehi* (therefore liable *stricto sensu* to a *nissaya-kamma*: see above, § 2 and n. 19), *pabbājanīya* is still valid, because of the provision that the chapter may choose to carry out such a procedure (referring to Vin II 13,23–37 [truncated E° to be filled in with 4,17–5,3]). – *Cf.* (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū(Pravṛ-v) 13,24–25 *kalaha-vivādādinā tarjanīyādi iṣṭakarma-karaṇaṃ bhavati*: “as concerns quarrels and strife and so on, the decision to apply the procedure of blame or another one is a matter of choice”. – As for how the decision is to be made practically, see below, § 6c.

Sp’s discussion gives further precision to the definition of °-*kammāraha* (see SVTT I 75–76, n. 3): a monk or nun is termed “liable to an x-procedure” from the moment the chapter resolves upon it by naming it explicitly (and irrevocably).

<sup>53</sup>Proceeding by triads; the same materials are dealt with by pentads at Vin V 181,27–82,27.

of the seven procedures the chapter eventually chooses (*ākaṅkhamāno*, 121,24–122,10 with Sp 1327,13–28,1), action *should* be taken (*kammaṃ kātabbhaṃ*) against unscrupulous, incompetent,<sup>54</sup> frivolous, immoral, disparaging monks, and against those who do not observe the penalty inflicted on them properly.

Indeed, one of the main differences between the set of procedures studied here and those of *parivāsalmānatta* lies in the phrase *ākaṅkhamāno saṃgho*. This difference is made clear by the occurrences of its synonym *saṃgho ... kammaṃ kattu-kāmo hoti*, in the sentence *sace* (or *idha pana*) *saṃgho upajjhāyassa* (or *saddhi-vihārikassa*, or *bhikkhussa*, or *bhikkhuniyā*) *kammaṃ kattu-kāmo hoti tajjanīyaṃ vā ... ukkhepanīyaṃ vā ...*,<sup>55</sup> “now if the chapter wishes to carry out a procedure of blame ... or of suspension against a preceptor (or his pupil, or a monk, or a nun) ...”. This phrase contrasts with the one which precedes it: *sace* (or *idha pana*) *upajjhāyo* (or *saddhi-vihārik*, or *bhikkhu*, or *bhikkhunī*) *garudhammaṃ ajjhāpanno hoti parivasāraho* (or *mānattārahā*) ..., “now if a preceptor [etc.] has committed a ‘heavy offence’ [*garu-dhamma*, *i.e.*, a Saṃgh.; see SVTT III 135–136 n. 52] and is liable to *parivāsa* (or *mānatta*). ...”<sup>56</sup> What this contrast means is that the redress of the five kinds of

<sup>54</sup>Vin 122,12 *bālo ca apakatatto ca*; according to Sp 1327,14–18, *bāla* here means: “ignorant of what is legitimate and what is not”, and *apakatatta* means: “unable to tell what is an offence from what is not” (and therefore “irregular” because guilty of the one or the other, out of ignorance; on *pakatatta*, see SVTT III 122–123, n. 18–19; 125, n. 27; 134, n. 50; on ignorance of the Pātimokkha rules, see *ib.* 132, n. 47). No disciplinary action should be taken on just one of these grounds (Sp 1327,15–16 *ettāvataṃ kammaṃ na kātabbhaṃ*, misunderstood at BD VI 191 n. 2), but only on both.

<sup>55</sup>Vin I 49,28–30 (= II 226,28–31) ≠ 53,3–5 (= II 230,13–15) ≠ 143,32–35 ≠ 145,16–18.

<sup>56</sup>Vin I 49,18–19 (= II 226,19–20) ≠ 52,31–32 (= II 230,2–3) ≠ 143,6–7f. ≠ 144,36–38.

misbehaviour described above, while it does entail procedures, may be achieved by any of those studied here:<sup>57</sup> it is left to the chapter to stress this or that factor (quarrelsomeness, ignorance, frivolity, etc.), and to charge a monk accordingly. As to the redress of Saṃgh. offences by otherwise very similar procedures, it leaves no such choice: the procedures have to be *parivāsa* and/or *mānatta* (depending not on the chapter's decision, but on whether the guilty monk concealed his offence or not).

This interpretation is confirmed by the prescriptions introduced by each of the two contrasting sentences just quoted, and by their commentary at Sp 981,8–20: if a chapter contemplates carrying out a *tajjanīya-kamma*, etc., against one's preceptor, etc., one is expected to plead for a lighter penalty, or for nonsuit,<sup>58</sup> or if the procedure has already been carried out, to encourage the sentenced person to behave properly; but if one's preceptor, etc., is liable to *parivāsa* and/or *mānatta*, one has no alternative but to plead for simply being allowed to act according to fixed procedures.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>57</sup>Except by *paṭisāraṇīya* according to the Cullavagga, but including it according to the Parivāra (references as above, n. 51), which means that a monk who happens to offend a lay donor may be sentenced to any of the seven penalties, if the chapter decides to stress another aspect of his misbehaviour.

<sup>58</sup>This is not, however, what Sāriputta and Moggallāna are reported to have done when enjoined by the Buddha to go and carry out a *pabbājanīya* procedure against monks who were, as stressed by the Buddha himself, their own pupils (Vin II 12,30 = III 182,37), unless their reported fright at the idea of dealing with the guilty monks is interpreted, *cum grano salis*, as an excuse, with the ulterior motive of dissuading the Buddha from taking such a step. The aggressiveness of Assaji and Punabbasuka towards their former *upajjhāyas* is, however, a well documented motif (see, e.g., Vin II 171,3–25).

<sup>59</sup>Vin I 49,19–27, 30–37 (= II 226,20–28, 31–38) ≠ 52,32–53,1, 53,5–12 (= II 230,4–12, 15–22) ≠ 143,11–12 f., 143,38–144,2, 7–9 ≠ 145,3–4 f., 22–23, 29–30. Monks may (and should) break their monsoon retreat for up to seven days for the same purposes.

The same distinction occurs in the Skt and Tib. Mū parallels to the Thv(M) prescriptions concerning one's preceptor, etc.,<sup>60</sup> the authority thus given to the Order when deciding which disciplinary procedure should be carried out (as opposed to the fixed rules to be applied in the granting of *parivāsa* and *mānatta*) is therefore not to be seen as a

Further confirmation comes from the very carefully devised stock phrases attributed to the Buddha when framing symmetrical or twin rules: compare *pañcahi bhikkhave aṅgehi samannāgatassa bhikkhuno ākaṅkhamāno saṃgho paṭisāraṇīya-kammaṃ kareyya : gihīnaṃ alābhāya parisakkati ... gihī gihīhi bhedeti ; imehi kho bhikkhave pañcah' aṅgehi s° bh° ākaṅkhamāno s° p°-kammaṃ kareyya. Aparehi pi pañcahi ... kareyya : gihīnaṃ buddhassa avaṇṇaṃ bhāsati ... ; imehi kho ... kareyya* (Vin II 18,33–19,2) with *tena hi bhikkhave saṃgho Vaḍḍhassa Licchavissa pattaṃ nikkujjatu asambhogam saṃghena karotu. Aṭṭhahi bhikkhave aṅgehi samannāgatassa upāsakassa patta nikkujjitabbo : bhikkhūnaṃ alābhāya parisakkati ... bhikkhū bhikkhūhi bhedeti, buddhassa avaṇṇaṃ bhāsati ... Anujānāmi ... pattaṃ nikkujjitum* (Vin II 125,13–22), and with *anujānāmi bhikkhave pañcah' aṅgehi samannāgatassa sāmaṇerassa- daṇḍa-kammaṃ kātum : bhikkhūnaṃ alābhāya parisakkati ... bhikkhū bh° bhedeti. Anujānāmi bh° imehi pañcah' aṅgehi sam° s° d°-kammaṃ kātum* (Vin I 84,9–15) (on *patta-nikkujanā* and *daṇḍa-kamma*, see below, resp. SVTT IX and VII; on *anujānāmi*, "I prescribe", see Bechert, "Schism Edict" 63). –A IV 344,24–25 reads however: *aṭṭhahi bhikkhave aṅgehi samannāgatassa upāsakassa ākaṅkhamāno saṃgho pattaṃ nikkujjeya* (*idem* with *ukkujjeya* at 345,8–9).

<sup>60</sup>The alternative character of the seven procedures studied here is expressed by the term *praṇidhi-karma*, "ad hoc procedure" at Mvy 9304, and in Guṇ-VinSū(Pravṛ-v) 14,12–17 : *saṃghe praṇidhātu-kāme* [Guṇ-VinSū 3,1] *utkṣepanīyādi-praṇidhikarma kartu-kāme saṃghe aho vata saṃgho niśrayasyedaṃ* [Guṇ-VinSū ib. *saṃgho 'syedaṃ*] *praṇidhi-karma na kuryāt. Iti tīvram autsukyam āpadyate nivartate yāvat āvṛhet* [sic] *iti sarvatraitad anuśaktaṃ veditavyaṃ. Kṛte avasārayet* [Guṇ-VinSū 3,2] *iti praṇidhi-karmaṇi kṛte aho vata saṃgho 'sya avasārayet* [sic] *iti. Parivāsa-mūlaparivāsa-mānāpya-mūlamānāpya-āvarhaṇārthini niśraye aho vata* [misprinted *vata*] *saṃgho* [sic] *asya parivāsādi-catuśkaṃ dadyāt* [≠ Guṇ-VinSū 3,2–4], *āvarhaṇārthini aho vata āvṛhet* [sic; ≠ Guṇ-VinSū 3,4] *iti. Cf. Banerjee, SarvLit 144–147, 145 n. 1.*

specific Thv(M) innovation (see also Guṇ-VinSū(Pravṛ) 13,24-25, quoted above, end of n. 53).

6c. The leniency of the chapter towards troublesome monks seems to depend chiefly on its choice between the penalties of *tajjanīya*, *nissaya*, *pabbājanīya*, on the one hand, and that of *ukkhepanīya* on the other: the restrictions on one's rights imposed by the latter are more severe (see below, § 8a-b).

How the chapter's choice from the whole set of alternative procedures works is exemplified at Sp 1159,2-4, 15-17 (Sp-ṭ III 368,15-17), and may well apply to the interpretation of the 53rd Thv(M) [bhī] Pāc. In the *nidāna* of the latter, whose subject is abusing (*akkosati*, *paribhāsati*) the chapter, a nun is described as *bhaṇḍana-kārikā*, etc. (as above, n. 18; cf. n. 53). If the implication (at Vin I 145,16-18) that the penalties dealt with here also apply to nuns has some practical application, such a nun is, *stricto sensu*, liable to a procedure of blame (*tajjanīya-kamma*) but is said instead to have been sentenced to suspension for refusing to see her offence (*āpattiyā adassane ukkhepanīya-kamma*) (Vin IV 309,26-28, 32, 310,10).<sup>61</sup>

In its commentary on the section of the *Kamma-kkhandhaka* in the Cullavagga that deals with the *ukkhepanīya-kamma* for refusing to see one's offence (Vin II 21,6-24,33), Sp 1159,2-4 states: "[The prescription that this kind of suspension may apply to] a quarrelsome monk and so on, means that after he has been charged, on the grounds of [raising] quarrels and so on, with an offence, the [*ukkhepanīya*] procedure which applies is for the very refusal to see

<sup>61</sup>The first part of this *nidāna* is identical with that of the 4th Thv(M) [bhī] Saṃgh. (Vin IV 309,24-310,13 = 230,27-231,18), which deals with the invalid restoration (*osāraṇā*; see below, end of § 8b, and n. 100; cf. below, SVTT V, § 6b) of a nun who was suspended for the same offence (for Chinese and Tibetan parallels, cf. *BhīPr* 79f., 119).

this [offence]".<sup>62</sup> As for *ukkhepanīya* for refusing to give up one's wrong opinions, Sp 1159,15-17 states: "The [*ukkhepanīya*] procedure which applies is for the very refusal to give up an opinion advocated in order to raise quarrels, etc."<sup>63</sup> Sp-ṭ III 368,15-17 (*ad* Sp 1159,3-4) explains how the reverse applies, *i.e.*, how a monk who refuses to see or redress his offence may be sentenced to a *tajjanīya* procedure: "As for the procedures of blame and so on, they are to be carried out when [a monk] refuses to see/redress the offence he has been charged with, by taking into account the quarrelsome-factor and so on."<sup>64</sup>

7a. According to the Cullavagga, the restrictions to be observed for *pabbājanīya* (the same as apply to *tajjanīya*) include the further provision that the sentenced monk(s) is (are) requested to leave the place.<sup>65</sup> As noted by Dutt, EBM 145, and v.Hi., "Buddhist Law" 21 and n. 40, this implies the sanction and assistance of lay authorities; the somewhat

<sup>62</sup>*Bhaṇḍana-kāraḷo* 'ti ādisu [Vin II 22,9, to be filled in, *mutatis mutandis*, with *ib.* 4,18-5,3] *bhaṇḍanādi-paccayā āpannaṃ āpattiṃ āropetvā tassā adassane yeva kammaṃ kātabbaṃ*.

<sup>63</sup>*Bhaṇḍana-kāraḷo* ti ādisu *yam dīṭṭhiṃ nissāya bhaṇḍanādinī karoti, tassā appaṭinissagge yeva kammaṃ kātabbaṃ*.

<sup>64</sup>*Tajjanīyādi-kammaṃ pana āpattiṃ āropetvā tassā adassane appaṭikamme vā bhaṇḍana-kāraḷādi aṅgehi kātabbaṃ*.

<sup>65</sup>Vin II 5,5-15 ≠ 8,20-23 ≠ 14,7-9; 6,26-7,15 ≠ 9,6-27 ≠ 15,6-27. Sp 624,18-31 states that the sentenced monk should leave both his residence (*vihāra*) and all surrounding villages or towns, whatever their size, unlike Upatissa, who would restrict banishment to a few houses if the neighbouring town and its streets are very large; this is, Sp states, just wishful thinking (*manoratha-matta*). As for the cancellation of this penalty, according to Sp 625,9-16, nothing should be accepted from donors even after it has become effective, except if the latter make gifts explicitly on account of morality (625,14-16 is not clear to me). Contrary to what might be expected logically, banishment is not listed among the threefold post-canonical "expulsions" (*nāsanā*).

stealthy way, as described at Sp 625,1-7,<sup>66</sup> of carrying out the procedure itself so as not to invalidate it by breaking the rules about boundaries (*sīmā*), also points to the difficulty of enforcing such a decision.

7b. Now, as stressed by Oldenberg, the narrative in the Cullavagga of the framing of the rule and its description of the procedure also occur *verbatim* in the *nidāna* of the 13th Thv(M) [bhu] Saṃgh., and an explicit reference to the *pabbājanīya* procedure is to be found in the canonical commentary.<sup>67</sup> The Cullavagga and *vibhaṅga* accounts as we have them now branch off as follows: the monks who have been subjected to a *pabbājanīya-kamma* accuse the (chapter of) monks of partiality, then go away, or return to lay life;<sup>68</sup> the Buddha then states that (Cullavagga) the penalty should not be revoked;<sup>69</sup> (*vibhaṅga*) monks who object to the

<sup>66</sup>Sp is not clear about exactly how an overlap (*ajjhottharati*) of boundaries (that of the guilty monks' place of residence and that of the incoming chapter who will perform the *pabbājanīya* procedure) is to be avoided (see Vin I 111,13-20; KP, *Sīmā* 88-92, 355-58). Neither does it give details about which kind of boundary was in force under the former monks; according to the *sikkhāpada* of the 13th Saṃgh. (Vin III 184,9-10\*\* *gāmaṃ vā nigamaṃ vā upanissaya viharati*), it might have been, accordingly, a *gāma-*° or a *nigama-sīmā*, that is, an "unfixed" (*a-sammata, a-baddha*) one (see Vin I 110,36-11,1; KP, *Sīmā* 82-83 and n. 138, 189-90; KP, "Nāgas and Sīmās", § 3).

<sup>67</sup>Vin II 9,29-13,22, 14,11-30 ≠ III 179,30-84,7; Vin III 185,30-31' *ayaṃ itthannāmo bhikkhu saṃghena pabbājanīyakamma-kato*. See Oldenberg, Vin I XVII-XIX, XXIII n. 1. Conversely, the Skt Mū parallel to the Cullavagga refers explicitly to the relevant Saṃgh. rule (MSV(D) III 18,18-19).

<sup>68</sup>*Pakkamanti pi vibbhamanti pi* (Vin II 14,24-25 = III 183,35); Sp 625,28-30: *pakkamanīti ... ekacce disā pakkamanti* [in which case the injunction to leave is respected — but out of rebellion, not submission to it]. *Vibbhamanīti ekacce gihī honti*.

<sup>69</sup>Vin II 14,11-36 (the statement to the contrary in DPPN [I 226] is puzzling). This means that the eighteenfold penalty remains in force

procedure<sup>70</sup> by accusing those who carried it out of partiality incur a Saṃgh. after a threefold informal, then formal admonition to stop doing so.

These two accounts are to be considered as a later insertion (the Cullavagga's being the latest); the Pātimokkha rule itself<sup>71</sup> just states that an ill-famed monk who refuses to leave after a threefold informal admonition to do so (arguing that those who admonish him do so out of partiality) incurs a Saṃgh.<sup>72</sup> It has been suggested<sup>73</sup> that the earlier subject of this Pātimokkha rule was the corruption of lay people's minds (*kula-dūsana*), which entailed a Saṃgh. offence after three informal, then formal admonitions (*yāva-tatiyaṃ samanubhāsana*) to stop doing so, whereby the guilty monk became liable to *mānatta/parivāsa*; after the *pabbājanīya* procedure was included in the *vibhaṅga* itself, the purpose of the Pātimokkha rule shifted from *kula-dūsana* (now dealt with by this very procedure) to objection to this same procedure by the sentenced monk, by means of words of abuse, and accusations of partiality against the chapter who carried

even if the sentenced monk returns to lay life (for a similar case with *parivāsa/mānatta*, see SVTT III 129-30, § 4).

<sup>70</sup>Vin III 183,27-84,32; 185,17-18' *so bhikkhū ti so kammakato bhikkhu* (cf. 185,30-33; 185,35 is to be filled in, *mutatis mutandis*, with the help of 173,36-74,8); see Kkh 47,31-48,4; cf. Vin V 7,9-11, Vin-vn 438, and below, n. 75.

<sup>71</sup>From which a descriptive stock phrase is extracted by the Cullavagga (see above, n. 20). The technical term *pabbājanīya-kamma* does not occur in this *sikkhāpada*, although the verb *pabbājenti* does (Vin III 184,20\*\*).

<sup>72</sup>Thv(M) Saṃgh n° 13 [bhu], Vin III 184,9-32\*\* with Kkh 47,26-48,9. Sp 613,25-29,16 (the proceedings are discussed at 624,7-25,30, 629,9-16); n° 17 [bhī]. — Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 48, n° 12. — Fragment from an unidentified school: SHT(III) 250 (988). — Conc.: BhīPr 54, table II.2 s.v. *kuladūṣakaḥ*.

<sup>73</sup>Nolot, "Règles" 432-38 (English summary: 541-42).



it out.<sup>74</sup> In all known *Bhikṣunī-Prātimokṣas* (except in the Mā. and Mā(-L) traditions),<sup>75</sup> the strict parallel to the 13th Thv(M) [bhu] Saṃgh. remained in force, but branched off into a still later, specific Saṃgh. rule, dealing with the case of a nun who accuses the chapter of partiality (in the very same terms as those of the 13th Thv(M) [bhu] Saṃgh. and its parallels) while objecting either to the decision reached after a formal dispute (*adhikaraṇa*) or to a disciplinary procedure (either a *pabbājanīya*-<sup>o</sup> or an *ukkhepanīya-kamma*) that was carried out against her.<sup>76</sup> There is no such Pātim rule for monks; neither do Kkh or Sp connect the nuns' rule with the 13th [bhu] Saṃgh. But Vjb (B<sup>e</sup> 1960) 362,11-16 does, and tries to explain away this redundant rule by sticking to its literal application: to consider the 8th [bhī] Saṃgh. as a useless duplication of the 13th [bhu] Saṃgh. (on the grounds that their purpose (dissuading the monk/nun from abusing the chapter and accusing it of partiality)<sup>77</sup> is identical) would be wrong, because both the *nidāna*'s account of the matter, and the procedure objected to by the nun,<sup>78</sup> are different.

<sup>74</sup>Traces of such a reinterpretation can be found in the Skt Sa. and Tib. Mū. *śikṣāpadas* of this Saṃgh. rule, whose wording is therefore later than the Pāli Thv(M) version: *niḥsrjātv āyuṣmāṃ cchandagāmi-vacanāṃ dveṣagāmi-bhayagāmi-mohagāmi-vacanāṃ; ... na cet pratiniḥsrjet saṃghāvaśeṣaḥ* (VinVibh(R) 75, lines 13-17; cf. PrMoSū 115 [BFd, v<sup>o</sup> 6] with *ib.* 132 [BLi, r<sup>o</sup> 3-5]); *niḥsrjāta imāṃ evamrūpāṃ kathāṃ ... na cet pratiniḥsrjeyuḥ saṃghāvaśeṣaḥ* (PrMoSū(Mū), 20,21-21,2 [reconstructed from Tib.; "Skt Mū." in Nolot, "Règles" 432-38, should be corrected accordingly]).

<sup>75</sup>See conc. in BhīPr 54, table II.2 s.v. *kuladūśakaḥ*.

<sup>76</sup>Thv(M) Saṃgh. n<sup>o</sup> 8 [bhī], Vin IV 237,31-39,3 with Kkh 165,17-21, Sp 914,29-15,2. - Conc.: BhīPr 54, table II.2 s.v. *kismiñci*.

<sup>77</sup>Vjb 362,12-13 quotes Kkh 48,1-2 (with *eva* for *evam*) *tassa vacanassa paṭinissaggāya evam vacanīyo, na kuladūsana-nivāraṇatthāya*.

<sup>78</sup>Conveniently alluded to only vaguely by Vin IV 237,33 *kismiñcid eva adhikaraṇe*.

8a. Suspension (*ukkhepanīya*) entails forty-three restrictions,<sup>79</sup> some of which are identical with those of *tajjanīya*<sup>80</sup>: a suspended monk should not grant ordination, give guidance to newly ordained monks, be waited upon by novices, be appointed as exhorter of nuns or exhort them if appointed before he became liable to any of the three procedures of suspension, commit again the same, or a similar, or a graver offence, criticize either the procedure he was subjected to or those who carried it out.

Some other restrictions also apply in the case of *parivāsa/mānatta*<sup>81</sup>: a suspended monk should refuse outward marks of respect and assistance from regular monks; he should not stay under the same roof as the latter, and should rise from his seat when meeting any of them.

Still others apply also to both *tajjanīya* and *parivāsa/mānatta*:<sup>82</sup> he may not suspend the participation of a regular monk in the ceremonies of *uposatha* or *pavāraṇā*; he should neither issue commands, nor exercise authority, nor urge a monk to acknowledge his offence,<sup>83</sup> nor quarrel with other monks.

Lastly, a monk against whom any type of suspension was carried out is subject to a further set of specific restrictions<sup>84</sup>: he should not accuse a regular monk of straying from morality, right behaviour, right opinions, or right means of livelihood (cf. above, n. 27); he should not cause splits between monks; he should dress neither like a layman nor

<sup>79</sup>Vin II 22,12-23,2 ≠ 23,25-24,27 ≠ 25,1-9 (truncated E<sup>e</sup>). As for Vin II 27,19-23, see below, end of this paragraph.

<sup>80</sup>Vin II 22,12-20, 12,34-13,2 ≠ 5,5-15; cf. above, § 5a.

<sup>81</sup>Vin II 22,20-23, 29-32 ≠ 31,5-9, 21-23; cf. SVTT III 119-22, § 1a.

<sup>82</sup>Vin II 22,34-23,2 ≠ 5,12-15 ≠ 32,7-11.

<sup>83</sup>This is normally a duty (see Freiberger, Br-Strafe 486-87, with further references; cf. below, SVTT X, § 2 a and n. 10).

<sup>84</sup>Vin II 22,23-29, 33-34; Sp I 155,23-56,12, I 159,1-14.

like a non-Buddhist ascetic, nor follow the latter kind of ascetics, but should follow the monks and train accordingly; he should not rebuke regular monks.

As for the third kind of suspension, it entails, according to the PTS edition of the Cullavagga,<sup>85</sup> the same eighteen restrictions as apply to *tajjanīya* (see above, § 5a). B<sup>e</sup> (1972) 75,6, 19 however reads *tecatālīsa-vattaṃ*, and accordingly lists<sup>86</sup> the same forty-three duties as apply to the first two kinds of suspension; this number also occurs at Vin V 212,37\*<sup>87</sup> ≠ Utt-vn 93ob, and in Sp.<sup>88</sup> The latter readings are supported both by the provisions said by canonical and other Thv(M) texts to apply to monks who were suspended on any of the three grounds,<sup>89</sup> and by the Skt Mū parallel (refs. as above, end of n. 33).

8b. In any case, the verdict of suspension is to be made known in all surrounding monastic residences, in the following terms: "The monk So-and-So has been subjected to a procedure of suspension for refusing to see his offence (or to redress it, or to give up a wrong opinion), involving

<sup>85</sup>Vin II 27,19-21 (truncated E<sup>c</sup>, referring to 5,5-15); 27,23 reads explicitly *aṭṭhārasa-vattaṃ*; no vv.ll. are recorded at Vin II 310; no corrections are mentioned at Vin II 363-64, V 259-60.

<sup>86</sup>B<sup>e</sup> 75,7-17, referring by *pa* to 63,21-64,2 = E<sup>c</sup> Vin II 22,20-34.

<sup>87</sup>*Ukkhittakā tayo vuttā, tecatālīsa sammāvattanā* (cf. Sp 1387,25-26).

<sup>88</sup>Sp 913,30-31 (ad Vin IV 232,21) *vatte vattantin ti tecatālīsappabhede netthāravatte vattamānaṃ*. Sp 1159,18-19 strongly states: *sammāvattanāyaṃ pi hi idha tecatālīsa yeva vatāni*, "indeed, as for proper behaviour, forty-three duties do apply here also"; C<sup>e</sup> (SHB 1948) 859,28-29 *idem*, with insignificant v.ll. Sp 1373,19-20 *tividhassa ca ukkhepanīya-kammaṃ teccatālīsa-vidhaṃ vattaṃ*; C<sup>e</sup> (SHB 1948) 1019,29-30 *idem*.

<sup>89</sup>See below, § 8b (Hüsken, "Vorschriften" 86, end of n. 105, should be corrected accordingly).

exclusion of his participation in dealings with the community."<sup>90</sup>

The implications of this verdict are detailed in canonical Thv(M) texts other than the *Kammā-kkhandhaka* of the Cullavagga: unlike a monk undergoing any of the other penalties dealt with here, a suspended monk is deprived of participation (*saṃbhoga*) in the distribution of material things (*āmisā*) and in the exposition of doctrine (*dhamma*),<sup>91</sup> and considered as "belonging elsewhere" (*nānā-saṃvāsaka*) than to the community who motioned suspension (*ukkhepaka*), until the penalty is revoked and his "restoration" (*osāraṇā*) is achieved *ipso facto*.<sup>92</sup> This "companionless"<sup>93</sup> monk is therefore debarred from participation<sup>94</sup> in any procedure (including *uposatha* and *pavāraṇā*) within this community, whose members acting in chapter should all "belong to the same community" (*samāna-saṃvāsaka*).<sup>95</sup>

<sup>90</sup>*Itthan-nāmo bhikkhu āpattiyā adassane/āpattiyā appaṭikamme/pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkhepaniya-kammakato a-sambhogam saṃghena* (Vin II 22,4-6 ≠ 27,15-18). The expected sentence is missing at 26,6-7 after *dhārayāmiti*, but is referred to at SBE XVII 381 (first three lines), and does occur at B<sup>e</sup> (1972) 60,1-2: *āvāsa-paramparaṇ ca bhikkhave saṃsatha Channo bhikkhu saṃghena āpattiyā appaṭikamme ukkhepanīyakamma-kato asambhogam saṃghenā ti*.

<sup>91</sup>Vin IV 137,30-35'.

<sup>92</sup>Vin IV 218,34' *a-paṭikāro nāma ukkhitto an-osārito*. See below, SVTT V, § § 6b-c.

<sup>93</sup>Vin IV 218,16\*\* *akata-sahāyo*; 219,1-3' *akata-sahāyo nāma samāna-saṃvāsakā bhikkhū vuccanti sahāyā. So tehi saddhiṃ n' atthi tena vuccati akata-sahāyo 'ti*.

<sup>94</sup>This is termed *saṃvāsa-nāsanā*, "expulsion from where one belongs" at Sp 582,23 (see below, SVTT VI, § 1 b and n. 8).

<sup>95</sup>Vin I 135,30-35, 168,1-5 (both times with *yathā dhammo kāretabbo*, which refers to the 69th [bhu] Pāc. [cf. next n.]), 320,7-10f., 321,14-16; Kkh 9,14-16 (cf. Kkh 128,2, Sp 582,21-23); see Kieffer-Pülz, *Simā* 63 and n. 103, Sp 1320,28-31 (ad Vin V 115,23) clearly states: *ukkhepanīya-kamma-kato ukkhittako nāma. Avasesa-catubbidha-tajjanīyādikamma-*

According to the *vibhaṅga* of the 69th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc., any monk who deals with, or sleeps under the same roof as, a monk who was suspended for refusing to give up a wrong opinion incurs a Pāc.; so does a nun who deals with a nun who was suspended on the same grounds;<sup>96</sup> but if she sides with a suspended monk (on any of the three grounds), she incurs a Pār., the gravest of offences, entailing immediate, definitive exclusion<sup>97</sup> (as far as can be seen, the eventuality of a monk following a suspended nun is not raised).<sup>98</sup>

One rule, applying specifically to nuns, states that any of them who restores (*osāreyya*) a suspended nun without formally consulting (*an-apaloketvā*; see SVTT I 80–81, § 3a) the chapter who moved suspension and securing the

*kato anukkhintako nāma. Ayañ hi uposathaṃ vā pavāraṇaṃ vā dhamma-paribhogaṃ vā āmisa-paribhogaṃ vā na kopeti.*

This provision should also apply to the annual *kaṭhina* ceremony of receiving and sharing cloth given by laymen, and to the privileges attached to it (see DEBMT s.v.). Although the Mahāvagga's *Kaṭhina-kkhandhaka* (Vin I 253,3–67,10) and its commentary (Sp 1105,32–14,6 [ChinSp 528–31]) are silent on this point, the Skt Mū parallel explicitly excludes the suspended monk from his share and privileges (MSV(D)II 157,17–19 ≠ KC, Kaṭh-v 56,1–3 ≠ Kaṭh-v(M) 205,6–8).

<sup>96</sup>Thv(M) Pāc. n° 69 [bhu], Vin IV 137,2–38,16 with Kkh 127,14–35, Sp 870,20–32; n° 147 [bhī]. – Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 80, n° 58. – Dh fragment: CASF(II) 166, n° 69. – Conc.: BhīPr 58, table IV.1 s.v. *utksiptānuvṛttih*. Any monk or nun who sides respectively with a male or female novice who was expelled for holding wrong opinions also incurs a Pāc. (see below, SVTT VI, § 2c and n. 19).

<sup>97</sup>Thv(M) Pār. n° 3, Vin IV 218,2–20,13 with Kkh 159,1–21, Sp 903,23–904,16 (cf. Vin-vn 1992–16, Utt-vn 176–77). – Conc.: BhīPr 53, table I s.v. *ukkhittānuvattikā*. – See also (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 267,13–69,2; with Chinese and Tib. Mū parallels in BhīPr 81–83 (in the three Mū versions, the nun is not precisely described as siding with a suspended monk, but as striving to persuade him that he should not submit to the chapter's sentence).

<sup>98</sup>Although Vin II 88,8–14 reports the monk Channa siding with (regular) nuns in a controversy (cf. below, SVTT X n. 14).

latter's consent incurs a Saṃgh., unless the suspended nun does behave properly or the chapter who moved suspension is absent.<sup>99</sup>

8c. As long as no one supports him, a suspended monk may therefore be said to belong nowhere (see below, SVTT VI n. 9). If, however, he manages to gather three or more followers (*ukkhittānuvattaka*), thus reaching the quorum required to create an autonomous Saṃgha, both parties should try to come to terms, so as to avoid a dissension or a split (*saṃgha-rāji*, °-*bheda*).<sup>100</sup> In the meantime, procedures carried out separately by each chapter within the same, common boundary (*sīmā*) are valid, since all members of each party belong to the same community (*samāna-saṃvāsaka*), and remain distinct (*nānā-saṃvāsaka*) from

<sup>99</sup>Thv(M) [bhī] Saṃgh. n° 4, Vin IV 230,27–32,23 with Kkh 163,34–64,11, Sp 913,27–14,2; cf. Vin V 56,15–17 ≠ 84,3–5; Hüsken, "Vorschriften" 83–86. – Conc.: BhīPr 54, table II s.v. *ukkhittam* (cf. above, n. 62). According to the Thv(M) *vibhaṅga* of this rule, a nun who plans to restore a suspended nun, and wants to gather a chapter and fix a boundary (cf. KP, *Sīmā* 132–33) for the purpose, should not do so without the agreement of the chapter who moved suspension (Vin IV 232,8° *osāressamūti gaṇaṃ vā pariyesati sīmāṃ vā sammannati*; cf. Kkh 164,2–3, where *gaṇa-pariyosāṇe* [= C° (SHB 1930) 165,29] should be corrected to °-*pariyesāṇe* [so Vin-vn 2073a]). The very *śikṣāpadas* of the Chinese Dha, Chinese Sa, Chinese Mī, and Chinese and Tib. Mū parallels make it explicitly part of the offence to step out of the *sīmā* for the purpose without having reached agreement to do so (BhīPr 79–83). The Chinese and Tib. Mū versions are corroborated by the reference to this same [bhī] Saṃgh. rule, at Guṇ-VinSū 65,1, by the words *bahih-sīmny avasāraṇe*, and by the provision that a monk who was sentenced to any of the seven penalties dealt with here should apply for restoration within the boundary where the chapter sentenced him (cf. above, n. 33; below, SVTT V n. 31).

<sup>100</sup>See HH, Po-v 223–25; cf. (Mū) Saṅghaṭṭh II 272,12–73,2 (taken over from MSV(D) IV 250,4–514).

those who belong to the other.<sup>101</sup> If the parties are eventually reconciled, the suspended monk may be restored (*osārita*) by his own followers;<sup>102</sup> a twofold procedure of reconciliation (*saṃgha-sāmaggi*) is then to be carried out for the purpose of putting an official end to any and all dissensions among the monks. An exceptional *uposatha*, with recitation of the Pātim rules, may then take place.<sup>103</sup>

BHS *utkṣiptānuvartikā*, f. : BhīVin(Mā-L) 102,5.

Skt *utkṣiptānupravṛtti*, f., "following a suspended [monk]" : (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 53,12.

*utkṣiptānuvartaka*, mfn. : (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 268,15-16. –  
*utkṣiptakānuvartaka*, m. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 176,9-10ff.,  
179,14, 190,18-19ff. (°-*anuvartakānuvartaka* 177,6 ff.,

<sup>101</sup>Vin I 337,1-40,38 with Sp 1148,21-50,2 ; see Kieffer-Pülz, *Śimā* 25 n. 25, 53-54, 121-23. Sp 1148,22-49,10 has a story about how failing to fill the latrine's water-pot ended in suspension, then creation of two rival communities ; this story occurs also at Dh-p-a I 53,16-54,17 ≠ Ja III 486,11-27, which record that the quarrel went so far as to create two factions among the Akaniṭṭha deities. A Skt Mū parallel occurs at MSV(D) II 174,5-76,2 (for Tib. Mū, cf. Banerjee, SarvLit 220-21).

Vin I 340,30-33 (with Sp 1149,24-31) ≠ V 116,34-37 (with Sp 1322,30-35) distinguishes between one who "belongs elsewhere by one's own will" (*attanā ... nānā-saṃvāsaka*) and one who does so because a procedure of suspension was carried out against him ; this distinction is expressed in Sp by the resp. terms *laddhi-nānāsaṃvāsaka*, "belonging elsewhere due to one's opinion", and *kamma-n*° (see KP, *Śimā* 63-65 ; cf. Vin-vn 3107b-109a). Skt Mū parallel : MSV(D) II 176,3-79,13 (cf. Guṇ-VinSū 99,28 *utkṣiptāṇ ca svakarmanī*).

<sup>102</sup>Cf. below, SVTT V n. 31.

<sup>103</sup>Vin I 356,22-58,37 with Sp 1152,24-31 (cf. Kkh 3,29-32) ; see Kieffer-Pülz, *Śimā* 53-54, 63-64, 121-23. Skt Mū parallel : MSV(D) II 190,13-96,6. – Pj II 196,10-12 *nanu āvuso oṣaṭṭaṃ vā vatthum yathā-dhammaṃ vinicchitabbam an-osārāpetvā eva vā aññamaññaṃ accayaṃ desāpetvā sāmaggi kātabbā* seems to refer to (illegally) dropping a case of suspension with mutual confession instead, followed by general reconciliation.

190,20f.) ; Saṅghabh II 272,13 f. (= MSV(D) IV 250,5 f.) (°-*anuvartakānuvartaka* ib. 272,14 f. = MSV(D) IV 250,6 f.).

*utkṣiptānuvṛtti*, f. : (Mū) Mvy 8480.

*utkṣepakānuvartaka*, m. : (Mū) MSV(D) II 177,6-7, 178,15, 191,7 f., IV 250,6 f. (= Saṅghabh II 272,14 f.) (°-*anuvartakānuvartaka*, m. : MSV(D) II 177,7, 179,16, 191,8 f. ; MSV(D) IV 250,6-7 f. = Saṅghabh II 272,15 f.).

8d. When suspension occurs during the observance of *parivāsa* or *mānatta* on account of some Saṃgh. offence, the latter penalties are to be resumed after restoration has put an end to suspension (Vin II 61,4-62,4 ; see SVTT III 129-30, § 4). In the reverse case (when a monk commits a Saṃgh. offence during the period of suspension) he may not be charged with concealment of the latter offence, and no procedure connected with its redress may be carried out against him by the chapter who motioned his suspension because, as an *ukkhittaka*, he does not belong to it anymore ; he is then, presumably, to be restored before he may acknowledge his Saṃgh. offence and apply for *mānatta* (see SVTT III 123, second part of n. 19).

According to Vin I 97,19-98,24, if a suspended monk returns to lay life (*vibbhamati*), then applies for a second ordination, he may be admitted again as a novice, provided he promises to see or redress his offence, or to give up his wrong opinions. Under the same conditions during each stage, he may be ordained again, then restored (*osāretabba*) ; if he now agrees to see his offence, etc., the matter is to be considered as settled ; if he refuses, and if the chapter reaches unanimous agreement about the case, he should be suspended again ; if unanimity is not reached, living in common with him entails no offence.<sup>104</sup>

<sup>104</sup>*Anāpatti sambhoge saṃvāse*, Vin I 97,19-98,25 with Sp 1034,12-17 (see KP, *Śimā* 133) ; Skt Mū parallel : Lévi, "Mss sanscrits" 34,1-11 ≠

56/7

8e. As occurs with *pabbājanīya* (see Oldenberg, Vin I xix and n. 1; above, § 7 b), the case of a monk who refuses to give up wrong opinions is also dealt with in the Pātim (where the technical term *ukkhepanīya-kamma* does not occur), whose provisions contradict those summarized above from texts of the later, *Khandhaka* type. After an identical *nidāna*,<sup>105</sup> the Buddha prescribes carrying out a procedure of suspension (Cullavagga, Vin II 26,30–27,18) and frames the Pātimokkha rule (Vin IV 135,16–30\*\*), which states that a monk who still holds wrong opinions after a threefold, informal admonition to stop doing so, simply incurs a Pāc.,<sup>106</sup> that is, an offence that may be redressed by just

MSV(D) IV 65,19–66,7. – Contrary to what was stated by Oldenberg (followed by Horner [see BD V vi and 39 n. 1 for references]), this does not really contradict the statement that, if a monk who was suspended on account of his wrong opinions returns to lay life, the penalty *should* be revoked (Vin II 27,24–28,7; B<sup>e</sup> (1972) 76,7 *idem*): these provisions most probably mean that, if the sentenced monk does not turn up again, the case is to be dropped altogether; but if he does and applies for a new ordination, the case is to be taken up again right from the beginning.

<sup>105</sup>Vin II 25,10–26,29 = IV 133,32–35,16; about the possible derivation of the latter from early sources, see BD III xv–xvi.

<sup>106</sup>Thv(M) Pāc. n° 68 [bhu], Vin IV 133,32–36,33 with Kkh 126,26–27,12, Sp 869,7–70,19 (869,26–29 occurs unabridged at Ps II 102,19–103,20); n° 146 [bhī]. – Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 80, n° 57. – Dh fragment: CASF(II) 165–66, n° 68. – Conc.: BhīPr 58, table IV.1 s.v. *dr̥ṣṭigatānūtsargah*. – This is, in the Thv(M) [bhu] Pātim, the only Pāc. offence established after a threefold admonition (*yāva-tatiyaṃ samanubhāsanā*; cf. below, SVTT X n. 10), from a total of eleven such rules (Vin V 140,16–17 with Sp 1344,31–33; cf. Sp 1412,7–10): [bhu] Saṃgh. n°s 10 to 13, [bhī] Saṃgh. n° 7 to 10 (leaving aside the four held in common with monks [(bhu) 10–13]), [bhī] Pār. n° 3, [bhī] Pāc. n° 36. The third [bhī] Pār. is explicitly connected with the *yāva-tatiyaṃ* Saṃgh. by Kkh 159,14 ≠ Sp 904,12–13. The 36th [bhī] Pāc., together with its Chinese-Dha parallel, is most probably considered as a *yāva-tatiyaṃ* offence because of its analogy with the 9th Thv(M) [bhī] Saṃgh. (Vin IV 294,6–11\*\* = 239,20–28\*\*); the only other parallels are in Chinese Mā. and BHS BhīVin(Mā-L), which, however, do not make it a *yāva-tatiyaṃ* offence (see BhīPr

confessing it to another, regular monk. Although the *vibhaṅga* turns this admonition into a formal threefold procedure, after which the monk is to be charged with a Pāc. (Vin IV 136,6–25), it mentions no procedure of suspension; neither does the *nidāna*, nor Kkh.<sup>107</sup> This procedure is, however, mentioned in the Chinese Sa. *nidāna*, and in the Mā-L *sikṣāpada*,<sup>108</sup> which are therefore to be considered later than their respective Thv(M) parallels.

103, with conc., *ib.* 67, table IV.3.II.B.3 s.v. *samsatt̥ha*; cf. BD III xvi–xvii).

Sp 1330,4–7 (*ad* Vin V 125,22–24) distinguishes the offence dealt with in the 68th Pāc. from suspension: it is committed “before the chapter” (*sammukhā*, *i.e.*, during the procedure of admonition; cf. SVTT II 99–101, § 2a), but redressed without formal procedures, that is, “outside [the chapter]” (*parammukhā*) (the whole is thus implicitly connected with what follows about Saṃgh. offences, whose redress does entail procedures; the same is stated explicitly at Utt-vn 515–18). Sp 1329,1–3 makes the same distinction: the offence of advocating a wrong opinion is committed “because of another’s legal statement” (*kammavācā*, *i.e.*, procedure), but redressed by one’s own statement when one confesses (*desento*) it in front of an individual monk. *Parammukhā* cannot refer to revoking suspension, which must be carried out by the chapter; *desento* refers to the regular redress of Pāc. offences, not to the observance of the prescribed duties (*sammā-vattanā*) required by the procedure of suspension.

<sup>107</sup>Unlike the case of *pabbājanīya*. As for the *vibhaṅga*, Sp 610,18–23 refers indirectly to the procedure of suspension, when arguing that the clause according to which “there is no offence for the first defaulter” (Vin IV 136,33 *anāpatti* [ ... ] *ādikammikassa*) is erroneous, because of the provision of the *Khandhaka* (Vin II 26,34–36) that the monk has first been reproved, reminded of his offence, and charged with it, but refuses nonetheless to give up a wrong opinion: this is what makes him an offender, whether he be the first one or not. *Ādikammika* accordingly does not appear at Vin-vn 1703, and Vjb (B<sup>e</sup> 1960) states that the *anāpatti ādikammikassa* clause occurs here “because it came into the scribe’s head” (*mukhārūl̥hena likhitam*; see Ud-a(Tr) II 916 n. 170 [Sp 246,10 shows that *mukhārūl̥ha* is not always pejorative]).

<sup>108</sup>VinVibh(R) 179; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,24–25. As for the Chinese Mā *sikṣāpada*, it is not clear from Pachow, CompSt 150, whether the

It is also mentioned in the *vibhaṅga* of the next Thv(M) [bhu] Pātim rule (Vin IV 137.27' f.), which states that any monk or nun who follows respectively a suspended monk or a suspended nun incurs a Pāc. (references as above, n. 97). It is also referred to in at least one version of the Skt Sa. *śikṣāpada*, and in the Chinese Sa. and Skt Mā-L *śikṣāpadas* of the same rule:<sup>109</sup> here again, these parallels are to be considered as later than the Thv(M) version.

procedure alluded to ("if he does not give up, the Saṃgha should perform a Karma") is that of threefold admonition or suspension.

<sup>109</sup>PrMoSū 260 (HL, v° 2). – VinVibh(R) 180, BhīPr 93, Pachow, Comp St 151. – PrMoSū(Mā-L) 23,26–27 (here again, it is not clear from Pachow ["Msg. 49", misprinted for "46"] to which *saṃghakarma*

V. *Nissāraṇā* (f.)/*nissāraṇīya* (n.),  
*osāraṇā* (f.)/*osāraṇīya* (n.)

1. The literal sense of the two contrasting terms *nissāraṇā* and *osāraṇā* is respectively "sending away, dismissal" and "introduction, invitation to come (back), restoration".<sup>1</sup> In Vinaya texts, they refer to various procedures whose general object is some kind or other of "dismissal" or "letting in". When these procedures are themselves each designated by a specific technical term, which is not always the case, *nissāraṇā* and *osāraṇā* then stand as contrasting superordinates including these technical terms as co-hyponyms: *nissāraṇā* includes *daṇḍakamma-nāsanā* (see below, § 3), *patta-nikujjanā* (§ 5) and the terms designating the seven disciplinary procedures (*tajjanīya*-°, *nissaya*-°, *pabbājanīya*-°, *paṭisāraṇīya*-°, and threefold *ukkhepanīya-kamma*) studied above in SVTT IV (see below, § 6a). In the same way, *osāraṇā* includes *patta-ukkujjanā* (§ 5), *abbhāna* (only once),<sup>2</sup> and the revocation (*patippassaddhi*, not a technical term *stricto sensu*) of any of the seven disciplinary

<sup>1</sup>*Osāreti* < \**ava-sārayati*, "causes to enter" (Kkh 131.34, Sp 1147.23 *pavesanā*, "entering"; cf. BD III 28 n. 4, and below, Skt parallels at the end of § 8c), rather than < \**ut-svārayati*, "propounds, calls" (CPD s.v.). Among the connected entries in CPD, *osāraṇa-kriyā* (Sp 1346.12–13 *ad* Vin V 142.20) is not "the formal act of *osāraṇā*", but belongs to 1. and means "performance of the exposition of the Pātimokkha". As will be seen below, apart from Kkh 131.34 and Vin-vn 3006, none of CPD's references s.v. *osāraṇā* concern "formal restoration ([...] after [...] practice of penance)".

<sup>2</sup>Sp 620.2–3 *abbhetabbo ... abbhānakamma-vaseṇa osāretabbo ti vuttam hoti*. CPD's statement, s.v. *osāreti*, that this verb is a "syn. of *abbheti*, *avhāyati*" (my emphasis), is misleading: the latter term applies specifically, and exclusively, to the readmission (*abbhāna*) of a monk or nun after completion of the *parivāsa* and/or *mānatta* penalties (see SVTT III 133–35, § 6). – As for the alleged equivalence of Skt Mū *utsāraṇa* with *āvayana*, see below, n. 51.

59/7

## Sources for the Study of the *Maṅgala* and *Mora-suttas*

### 1) *Maṅgala-sutta*

In an earlier article I noted the existence of two Tibetan versions of the *Maṅgala-sutta*. The first, the *bKra śis chen po'i mdo* = *Mahāmaṅgala-sutta*, is a translation of a Theravādin version, included in the set of "13 new translations" done by Paṇḍita Ānandaśrī of Ceylon and Thar pa Lotsaba Ņi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po in about the first decade of the 14th century. The second is an anonymous translation of a version of an unknown school, bearing the title *Lhas źus pa'i bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa* = *Devapariṭṭhā Maṅgalagāthā*.<sup>1</sup> These two versions have been translated side-by-side by Feer, who noted that "quoique [*Devapariṭṭhā Maṅgalagāthā*] renferme plus de stances que l'autre, et que l'ordre des stances y soit interverti, la commune origine des deux textes est facile à reconnaître".<sup>2</sup> In addition to the two Tibetan parallels, there is a third version, preserved in Chinese translation. It is

<sup>1</sup> Peter Skilling, "Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation", *JPTS* XIX (1993) 129–30, 183. Since the second version is anonymous, it cannot be dated with certainty. It is likely, however, that it was translated during the early diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet (the *śna dar*). The *lDan dkar Catalogue*, which dates to the early 9th century, lists a number of titles under the category *bKra śis kyi rnam grañs* = *\*Maṅgala-paryāya* (§ XVIII). Our text might be, for example, the *bKra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa chen po* = *\*Mahāmaṅgala-gāthā* (no. 476, in 30 *ślokas*), or the *bKra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa* = *\*Maṅgala-gāthā* (no. 478, in 26 *ślokas*) (references to Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan", *Journal asiatique*, 1953). For *svasti-* or *maṅgala-gāthā* see Peter Skilling, "The Rakṣā Literature of the Śrāvakayāna", *JPTS* XVI (1992) 129–37.

<sup>2</sup> Léon Feer, "Fragments extraits du Kandjour", *Annales du Musée Guimet* V (1883) 224–27. For a translation of a Sinhalese commentary on the *Maṅgala-sutta* see Charles Hallisey, "Auspicious Things", in Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (ed.), *Buddhism in Practice*, Princeton, 1995, pp. 412–26.

607

included in a recension of the *Dhammapada*, the *Fa chü p'i yü ching*, where it makes up the whole of Chapter 39 (the last), entitled *Mahāmaṅgala*.<sup>3</sup> The correspondence was noted by Beal over a century ago. The prose *nidāna* is entirely different from that of the Pāli,<sup>4</sup> and the order and contents of the verses also differ. In Beal's translation, I have found only four verses that immediately bring to mind Pāli counterparts, but many individual lines also correspond to the Pāli. The *Fa chü p'i yü ching* is an early witness, translated during the Western Chin dynasty (CE 290–306),<sup>5</sup> and a new translation and comparative study of this short but important text is a desideratum.

In the *\*Maṅgala-varga*, Chapter 12 of his *\*Satyasiddhi* (or *\*Tattvasiddhi*) *Śāstra*, Harivarman cites three verses from the *\*Maṅgala-gāthā*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Taishō 211, Vol. 4; Lewis R. Lancaster with Sung-bae Park, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*, Berkeley, 1979 (= KBC), 1020; English translation in Samuel Beal, *Texts from the Buddhist Canon, Commonly known as Dhammapada, with accompanying Narratives*, [Boston, 1878] San Francisco, 1977, pp. 174–76. For the Chinese *Dharmapada* literature see Sylvain Lévi, "L'Apramāda-varga. Étude sur les recensions des Dharmapadas", *Journal asiatique*, septembre-octobre 1912, pp. 203–94; Charles Willemen, "The Prefaces to the Chinese Dharmapadas, Fa-chü ching and Ch'u-yao ching", *T'oung Pao* LIX (1973) 203–19; Charles Willemen, *Dharmapada: A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dharmapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*, Brussels, 1974.

<sup>4</sup> Beal (*op. cit.*, p. 23) noted that the *nidānas* assigned to the verses of the *Fa chü p'i yü ching* are entirely different from those of the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*.

<sup>5</sup> Date from KBC 1020.

<sup>6</sup> N. Aiyaswami Sastri, *Satyasiddhiśāstra of Harivarman*, Vol. I, Baroda, 1975 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 159), p. 37 (translation from Chinese into Sanskrit); Vol. II (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 165), Baroda, 1978, pp. 29–30 (English translation). The text is the *Ch'eng shih lun*, translated by Kumārajīva in 411–12: Taishō 1646, KBC 966.

So says the *Maṅgala-gāthā*:

The most auspicious is the Buddha  
who is the highest teacher and the wisest leader  
amongst men and gods.  
The most auspicious is the person  
who has firm faith in the Buddha  
and keeps pure conduct.  
The most auspicious is  
to serve the learned, not to approach the ignorant  
and [to] pay homage to the worthy of homage.

Aiyaswami Sastri notes that "of these three verses only the third agrees with the *Maṅgala-sutta*, verse 2". The first two verses have no counterpart in the *Fa chü p'i yü ching*.

Verse 3 of the Pāli *Maṅgala-sutta* has a parallel in prose and verse in the *Cakka-sutta*, the first sutta of the *Cakka-vagga* of the *Catukka-nipāta* of the *Anguttara-nikāya* (AN II 32).<sup>7</sup> The Pāli *Maṅgala-sutta* reads as follows:<sup>8</sup>

*patirūpadesavāso ca pubbe ca katapuññatā  
attasammāpanidhi ca etaṃ maṅgalam uttamam.*

To live in a favourable place,  
to have accomplished merit in the past,  
to have a proper goal for oneself—  
this is the highest auspiciousness.

<sup>7</sup> The reference was noted by Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith in their edition of the *Sutta-nipāta*, originally published in 1913 (p. 46, n. 9). The title is from the *uddāna*, p. 44.13, *cakko*. Cf. also *Nettipakarāṇa*, p. 29.14–19.

<sup>8</sup> *Suttanipāta* v. 260, p. 46; *Khuddaka-pāṭha* p. 3.5.



61/7

The Tibetan *Devapariṣcchā-maṅgala-gāthā* reads:<sup>9</sup>

yul bzañ gnas dan grogs mchog dan//  
sñon chad bsod nams byas pa dan//  
sems ni legs par gtañ byas pa//  
de ni bkra śis dam pa yin//

To live in an auspicious place, to [have] excellent company,  
to have accomplished merit in the past,  
to have properly directed one's mind—  
this is the highest auspiciousness.

The *Cakka-sutta* lists four “wheels” or “blessings” (*cakka*).<sup>10</sup> Wheels number 1, 3, and 4 have counterparts in v. 3 of the Pāli *Maṅgalasutta*, and wheel no. 2 may be compared with the *paṇḍitānañ ca sevanā* of v. 2b. The Tibetan *Devapariṣcchā-maṅgalagāthā* gives counterparts of all four *cakka*, in the order 1, 2, 4, 3, with a variant in 3, *citta* (*sems*) where the Pāli has *atta*.

<sup>9</sup> Peking Tripiṭaka (Q) 442, Vol. 9, *rgyud tsha*, 318b1; Q721, Vol. 11, *rgyud ya*, 276a1; Q1053, Vol. 45, *'dul ba phe*, 315a3; Q5943, Vol. 150, *ño mshar mo*, 330a4; Derge Tanjur 4400, *sna tshogs ño*, 337b7. Note that in both the Peking and Derge Tanjur versions the text is entitled simply *Maṅgala-gāthā* = *bkra śis kyī tshigs su bcaḍ pa*.

<sup>10</sup> For the significance of *cakka* in this context, cf. *Jātaka* V 114.27 *paṭirūpadesavāsādino kusalacakkassa bhañjani*, PED 259a (s.v. *cakka*), and Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, Vol. II, *Dictionary*, [New Haven, 1953] Delhi, 1972, p. 221a (s.v. *cakra*). The *Manorathapūraṇi* (Thai script Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya ed., II 378.17 has *cakkānīti sampattiyo, catucakkaṃ vattatīti cattāri sampatticakkāni vattanti ghattiyanti yevāti attho*. The *Āṅguttara-ṭīkā* (Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti ed., II 280.8) and the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* (Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya ed., III 328.1, commenting on the *Dasuttara* version) also interpret *cakka* as *sampatti-cakka*, without further explanation. Rendawa's commentary (reference below, n. 16) explains that “these four conditions are called ‘wheels’, for they are similar to the wheels of a carriage”.

cattār' imāni bhikkhave cakkāni yehi samannāgatānaṃ devamanussānaṃ catucakkaṃ pavattati, yehi samannāgatā devamanussā na cirass' eva mahantataṃ vepullataṃ pāpuṇanti bhogesū. katamāni cattāri?

- (1) *paṭirūpadesavāso*
- (2) *sappurisūpassayo*
- (3) *attasammāpaṇidhi*
- (4) *pubbe ca katapuññatā*.

imāni kho bhikkhave cattāri cakkāni yehi samannāgatānaṃ devamanussānaṃ catucakkaṃ pavattati, yehi samannāgatā devamanussā na cirass' eva mahantataṃ vepullataṃ pāpuṇanti bhogesū ti.

*paṭirūpe vase dese ariyamittakaro siyā  
sammāpaṇidhisampanno pubbe puññakato naro  
dhaññaṃ dhanam yaso kitti sukhañ c' etam adhivattati.*

There are, O monks, these four wheels: for gods and humans who possess them there occurs a fourfold blessing, by means of which gods and humans soon attain greatness and plenitude in wealth.<sup>11</sup> What are the four?

- (1) to live in a favourable environment
- (2) to associate with worthy persons
- (3) to have a proper goal for oneself, and
- (4) to have accomplished merit in the past.

<sup>11</sup> It is interesting that while the Pāli version refers to “wealth” (*bhoga*), the Sanskrit refers to “wholesome dharmas” (*kuśala-dharma*: see below).

62/7

These, O monks, are the four wheels...

The man who lives in a favourable place,  
who makes friendship with the noble ones,  
who possesses a proper goal,  
and has made merit in the past—  
grain, wealth, fame, honour, and happiness  
come to him in abundance.<sup>12</sup>

A Sarvāstivādin counterpart of the *Cakka-sutta* is incorporated into the Sanskrit *Daśottara-sūtra* from Central Asia:<sup>13</sup>

*catvāro dharmā bahukarāḥ, catvāri devamanuṣyāṇāṃ cakrāṇi yair deva... (text fragmentary)...yamānā vṛddhiṃ vaipulyam āpadyante kuśalair dharmaiḥ. katamāni catvāri?*

- (1) *pratirūpo deśāvāsah*
- (2) *satpuruṣāpaśraya*
- (3) *ātmanaś ca samyakpraṇidhānam*
- (4) *pūrve ca kṛtapunyatā.*

A counterpart from a text of the Sāmmatiyas is cited in Daśabalaśrīmitra's *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*:<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Manorathapūraṇi* II 379.6 *sukhañ c' etaṃ adhvattatīti sukhañ ca etaṃ puggalaṃ adhvattatī avattharatīti attho.*

<sup>13</sup> Kusum Mittal, *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus* (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden IV), Berlin, 1957, § IV, 1, p. 61. The parallel in the Pāli *Dasuttara-sutta* (DN III 276.5–8) gives only the bare list of the four, similarly described as *cattāro dhammā bahukārā.*

<sup>14</sup> Daśabalaśrīmitra (sTobs bcu dpal bśes gñen), *'Dus byas dan' 'dus ma byas rnam par nes pa*, Q5865, Vol. 146, no *mtshar bstan bcos ño*, 162b8. For this text see Peter Skilling, "The *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya* of Daśabalaśrīmitra,

Continues...

*'khor lo bzi zes bya ba ni/ 'khor lo chen po bzi ste/ 'di ltar/ mthun pa'i yul du gnas pa dan/ skyes bu dam pa la brten pa dan/ bdag gi smon lam yan dag pa dan/ sñon bsod nams byas pa'o// de dan yan dag par ldan pa'o//*

The four wheels: there are four great wheels (*mahācakra*): to live in a favourable environment, to associate with worthy persons, to have a proper aim for oneself, and to have accomplished merit in the past. He is endowed with these.

The four are listed in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, a Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon of the early 9th century, under the title "The four wheels of gods and humans" (*catvāri devamanuṣyāṇāṃ cakrāṇi, lha dan mi'i 'khor lo bzi'i min*):<sup>15</sup>

- (1) *pratirūpadeśa-vāsah, 'thun pa'i yul na gnas pa*
- (2) *satpuruṣāpaśrayam, skyes bu dam pa la brten pa*
- (3) *ātmanah samyak praṇidhānam, bdag nüd kyis yan dag pa'i smon lam btab pa*
- (4) *pūrve ca kṛtapunyatā, sñon yan bsod nams byas pa'o.*

The four *cakras* are given in verse in Nāgārjuna's *Suḥrillekha* (v. 61):<sup>16</sup>

*Buddhist Studies Review* 4/1 (1987) 3–23, and "Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation", *JPTS* XIX (1993), pp. 140–42.

<sup>15</sup> Mvy § LXXXIII, nos. 1603–7.

<sup>16</sup> Venerable Lozang Jamspal, Venerable Ngawang Samten Chopel, and Peter Della Santina (tr.), *Nāgārjuna's Letter to King Gautamīputra*, Delhi, 1978, Tibetan text, p. 91 (translation p. 37). Cf. the translations and commentaries in Leslie Kawamura, *Golden Zephyr: Instructions from a Spiritual Friend*, Emeryville, 1975, p. 55; Geshe Lobsang Tharchin and Artemus B. Engle, *Nāgārjuna's Letter: Nāgārjuna's "Letter to a Friend" with a Commentary by the Venerable Rendawa, Zhön-nu Lo-drö*, Dharamsala, 1979, pp. 93–94.

64/7

## Praises of the Buddha beyond Praise\*

The recollection of the Buddha according to the *iti pi so* formula is an ancient practice, recommended by the Sakyan Sage himself in the *Dhajagga-sutta* (*Sagāthavagga*, *Samyutta-nikāya*). The formula lists nine qualities of the Buddha, which came to be known as the *nava-buddha-guṇa*. It was recognized early on, however, that the qualities or virtues of the Buddha were without limit. The idea that the Buddha is beyond praise (*aparimānavanno*) is expressed in a stock passage uttered by several leading brāhmaṇas of the time, such as Soṇadaṇḍa, Kūṭadanta, and Caṅkī, each of whom is reported to declare:<sup>1</sup> “I have mastered only so many of the praises of the respected Gotama, but this is not the full measure of his praises: the respected Gotama merits unlimited praise”.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* Unless otherwise noted references are to Pali Text Society (PTS) editions. For the *aṭṭhakathā* I also refer to Burmese script Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti (ChS) editions, and to Thai script editions published by the Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya (Mm) and the Bhūmibalo Foundation (BhB).

<sup>1</sup>DN I 117.14 *ettake kho ahaṃ bho tassa bhoṭo gotamassa vanne pariyāpunāmi, no ca kho so bhavaṃ gotamo ettakavanno, aparimānavanno hi so bhavaṃ gotamo*: also at DN I 133.23 (*Kūṭadanta-sutta*) and MN II 168.3 (*Caṅkī-sutta*). There does not seem to be any parallel passage in the Chinese version of the *Soṇadaṇḍa-sutta*: see Konrad Meisig, “Chung Têh King—The Chinese Parallel to the Soṇadaṇḍa-Sutta”, in V.N. Jha (ed.), *Kalyāna-mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume*, Delhi, 1991, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup>“And so far only do I know the excellencies of the Samaṇa Gotama, but these are not all of them, for his excellence is beyond measure”: T.W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, [1899] London 1973, p. 150; “However much I might praise the ascetic Gotama, that praise is insufficient, he is beyond all praise”: Maurice Walshe, *Thus Have I Heard: The Long Discourses of the Buddha*, London, 1987, p. 128; “To this extent I, sirs, know the good Gotama’s splendour, but this is not the (full) extent of the good Gotama’s splendour—immeasurable is the splendour of the good Gotama”: I.B. Horner, *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-nikāya)*, Vol. II, London, [1957] 1975, p. 358; “This much is the praise of Master Gotama that I have learned, but the praise of Master Gotama is not limited to that, for the praise of Master Gotama is

*Continues...*

This natural statement, which culminates a long eulogy of the Buddha, was later rephrased as a general principle: "The Buddhas, the Blessed Ones, merit unlimited praise".<sup>3</sup> In the *Apadāna*, Gatasaññaka Thera refers to the Buddha Tissa as "an ocean of unlimited virtues" (*anantaḡuṇasāgara*).<sup>4</sup> What had started out as a rather straightforward fact took on a mystical flavour.

The following passage shows how this concept was presented in Siam at the beginning of the 19th century. It is taken from the *Traibhūmilokavinicchayakathā*, also known as the *Traibhūmi chabap luang*, which was composed at the behest of Rāma I, the first king of the Chakri Dynasty, by Phraya Dharmaprijā (Kaew) in Culasakkarāja 1164 or BE 2345, that is CE 1802.<sup>5</sup> The citation is from the beginning of the first chapter (*paṭhamapariccheda*), on homage to the Three Gems (*kham namaskār phra ratanatray*). The prose is in Thai, the verses in Pāli.<sup>6</sup>

immeasurable': Bhikkhu Nānamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Kandy, 1995, p. 778.

<sup>3</sup> *Udāna-aṭṭhakathā* (Mm) 524.1 *aparimāṇavaṇṇā hi buddhā bhagavanto*.

<sup>4</sup> *Apadāna* (Nālandā ed.) I 151 (PTS p. 127).

<sup>5</sup> Fine Arts Department (ed.), Phraya Dharmaprijā (Kaew), *Traibhūmilokavinicchayakathā chabap ti 2 (Traibhūmi chabap luang)*, Bangkok, 2520 [1977], Vol. 1, pp. 15–16. For a brief note on the textual history of the *Traibhūmi* genre, see Peter A. Jackson, "Re-interpreting the Traiphuum Phra Ruang: Political Functions of Buddhist Symbolism in Contemporary Thailand", in Trevor Ling (ed.), *Buddhist Trends in Southeast Asia*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, 1993, pp. 69–70. For Phraya Dharmaprijā see H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat, "The Reconstruction of Rāma I of the Chakri Dynasty", in *Collected Articles by H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat reprinted from the Journal of the Siam Society*, Bangkok, 1969, p. 159 (originally published in *Journal of the Siam Society* XLIII-1, 1955).

<sup>6</sup> I give in parentheses selected phrases that derive from Pāli or Sanskrit, in their Thai orthography. *phra* (rendered here as "holy"), *chao* (rendered here as "lord"), and *somdet* (not translated) are frequently attached to the names or titles of objects or persons of respect in Thai.

The Holy (*phra*) Buddhagaṇa (virtues or qualities of the Buddha) are endless (*ananta*), vast (*vitthāra*), and wide, and their limit cannot be reached: it is beyond the ability of all of the deities, such as Indra or Brahma, to enumerate (*barranā*) the Holy Buddhagaṇa to the limit or to the end. It is the same even for the Holy Omniscient Lord Buddha (*Phra Sabbaññūbuddha Chao*): he can enumerate his own holy qualities, but even he is unable to enumerate them to the limit and to the end. Though he may continue to enumerate them, his life-span (*phra janmāyu*) will be exhausted before [he can finish]: it is impossible to know the end or know the limit of the Holy Buddhagaṇa. The matter is suitably explained by these verses:

*sahasasīso<sup>7</sup> pi ce poso sīse sīse satam mukhā  
mukhe mukhe satam jivhā jivakappo mahiddhiko  
na sakkoti ca vaṇṇetum<sup>8</sup> nisesam satthuno ḡuṇam.*

Even if a person had a thousand heads—  
each head with a hundred mouths,  
each mouth with a hundred tongues—  
and even if he could live for an aeon  
and possessed great supernormal power:  
he would still be unable to enumerate  
the virtues of the Teacher in full.

*buddho pi buddhassa bhaṇeyya vaṇṇam  
kappam pi ce añṇam abhāsamāno*

<sup>7</sup> *-sīse Traibhūmi*: I follow here the Khmer citation (see below), to read *-sīso*.

<sup>8</sup> *vaṇṇetu Traibhūmi*: I follow here the Khmer citation, to read *vaṇṇetum*.

647

*khīyetha kappo ciradīgham<sup>9</sup> antare  
vanṇo na khīyetha tathāgatassa.*

If a Buddha were to speak in praise of a Buddha, speaking nothing else for an aeon's length, sooner would the long-standing aeon reach its end, but the praise of the Tathāgata would not reach its end.<sup>10</sup>

The first verse may be explained as follows: a man possessing great supernormal power (*mahiddhi-rddhi*) conjures up (*nrmit*) a multitude of heads, 1000 in number. Each of these heads has 100 mouths, and each of these mouths has 100 tongues—this amounts to 100,000 mouths and to 10 million tongues. The man has a long life-span, as long as one aeon (*kappa*). If he does not engage in any other activity at all, but devotes himself only to the praise of the Holy Buddhagaṇa, throughout the day and throughout the night, until his aeon-long life-span is exhausted—he would nonetheless be unable to enumerate the Holy Buddhagaṇa to the end or to the limit.

The second verse may be explained thus: Somdet the Holy Omniscient Lord Buddha has a long life-span of an aeon; if he does not preach on any other subject at all, but, as in the

<sup>9</sup> *Traibhūmi* only reads *cira-*, against the *cira-* of the *aṭṭhakathā* (see below).

<sup>10</sup> I take the translation from Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Discourse on the All-embracing Net of Views: The Brahmajāla Sutta and its Commentarial Exegesis*, Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy, 1978, p. 330; cf. also translations in Peter Masfield, *The Udāna Commentary (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Udānaṭṭhakathā)*, Vol. II, Oxford, 1995, p. 871; and in I.B. Horner, *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Madhuraṭṭhaviṭṭasīnī)*, London, 1978, pp. 193–94. Horner did not understand the verse.

previous example, preaches only on the Holy Buddhagaṇa of Somdet the Holy Omniscient Lord Buddha, throughout the day and throughout the night, and continues preaching until the end of that long stretch of time, to the limit of his aeon-long life-span—the Holy Buddhagaṇa of Somdet the Holy Tathāgata the Ten-powered one (*Daśabala*) would not yet be exhausted.

I have not been able to trace the origin of the first verse, which is also cited in Pāli in a Khmer “Itipiso” text.<sup>11</sup> The second verse, however, is well attested in the commentarial literature, being cited without specific attribution in (at least) the following sources:<sup>12</sup>

—*Dīgha Aṭṭhakathā*, commenting on the *Sonadanda-sutta* (DN 4);<sup>13</sup>

—*Dīgha Aṭṭhakathā*, commenting on the *Sampasādaniya-sutta* (DN 28);<sup>14</sup>

—*Majjhima Aṭṭhakathā*, commenting on the *Caṅkī-sutta* (MN 95);<sup>15</sup>

—*Udāna Aṭṭhakathā*, commenting on the third sutta of the *Jaccandha-vagga*;<sup>16</sup>

—*Cariyāpiṭaka Aṭṭhakathā* (twice);<sup>17</sup>

<sup>11</sup> F. Bizot and O. von Hinüber, *La guirlande de Joyaux (Textes bouddhiques du Cambodge 2)*, Paris, 1994, (text) 135, (translation) 180–81.

<sup>12</sup> I have culled the references from the notes to the Chatthasaṅgīti editions. The verse is usually introduced by *vuttam h' etam* (*vuttam pi c' etam*, *vuttañ c' etam*, etc.).

<sup>13</sup> (PTS) 288 (not seen); (ChS) [I] 257.8; (Mm) I 356.8; (Nālandā ed.) 315.25 (cf. comment in *ṭīkā*, ChS [I] 318.7–10).

<sup>14</sup> (Mm) III 80.8; (ChS) [III] 61 (not seen).

<sup>15</sup> (Mm) III 388.16; (ChS) III 209 (not seen).

<sup>16</sup> (ChS) 305, bottom; (Mm) 426.4. A similar statement is made in prose at (Mm) 542.1–4.

<sup>17</sup> (ChS) 9.1; 324.12; (BhB) 13.8; 506.7.

67/7

- Apadāna Aṭṭhakathā*;<sup>18</sup>  
 —*Buddhavamsa Aṭṭhakathā*;<sup>19</sup>  
 —*Dīghanikāya-tīkā (Linatthappakāsanā)*.<sup>20</sup>

The references show that the verse was well-known by 5th century, the time of Buddhaghosa, as well as to the commentators Dhammapāla and Buddhadatta.<sup>21</sup>

Nandapuri

Peter Skilling

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Jacqueline Filiozat  
 École Française d'Extrême-Orient  
 22, avenue du Président Wilson  
 75116 Paris  
 France

Leslie Grey  
 3131 E. Alameda, Apt. 1905  
 Denver  
 CO 80209  
 U.S.A.

William Pruitt  
 109 East Main Street, Apt. 1E  
 Westminster  
 MD 21157-5031  
 U.S.A.

Peter Skilling  
 68/123 Prachanivet 4  
 Prachachun Road  
 T. Tasai, A. Muang, Nonthaburi  
 Thailand 11000

1998

<sup>18</sup> (ChS) II 91.17.

<sup>19</sup> (PTS) 135.9; (BhB) 250.1; (ChS) 163 (not seen).

<sup>20</sup> *Sīlakkhandhavagga-tīkā* (ChS) 51.1.

<sup>21</sup> The idea of talking for an aeon or more is found in the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*: Étienne Lamotte, *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*, Louvain, 1962, pp. 257–58. Lamotte (n. 17) refers to a similar hyperbole in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*.

*mthun par gyur ba'i yul na gnas pa dañ//*  
*skyes bu dam pa la ni brten pa dañ//*  
*bdag ñid legs smon sñon yañ bsod nams bgyis//*  
*'khor lo chen po bzi ni khyod la mña'//*

You possess these four great wheels (*mahācakra*):<sup>17</sup>  
 dwelling in a favourable environment,  
 association with worthy persons,  
 a proper goal for yourself,  
 and accomplishment of merit in the past.

## 2) Mora-paritta

The Pāli *Jātaka* gives a prose story of a golden peacock twice, as the *Mora-jātaka* (No. 159) and the *Mahāmora-jātaka* (No. 491).<sup>18</sup> The basic narrative has a parallel near the end of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya*<sup>19</sup> and in the *Mahāmāyūri-vidyārājñī*.<sup>20</sup> A parallel to verse 2 of the *Mora-sutta* occurs in the *Mahāmāyūri-vidyārājñī*, with additions and variants and with the lines in a different sequence:<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> It is interesting that of the texts studied here, only the Sāmmatiya citation and Nāgārjuna describe the four wheels as "great" (*mahā*).

<sup>18</sup> For references see Leslie Grey, *A Concordance of Buddhist Birth Stories*, Oxford, 1994, pp. 253, 218.

<sup>19</sup> Nalinaksha Dutt (ed.), *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 1, [Srinagar, 1947] Delhi, 1984, pp. 287.11–288.13. Cf. Jampa Losang Panglung, *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*, Tokyo, 1981, p. 62.

<sup>20</sup> Shūyo Takubo (ed.), *Ārya-Mahā-Māyūri Vidyā-Rājñī*, Tokyo, 1972, 7.9–9.18. Cf. the translation and discussion (which notes the relation to the Pāli *jātakas*) in A.F. Rudolf Hoernle, *The Bower Manuscript*, Calcutta, 1893–1912, pp. 240a–e.

<sup>21</sup> Takubo, p. 6, ult; cf. also 38.17–39.1; 42.16–20.

63/7

*Mora-paritta*<sup>22</sup>

*Mahāmāyūri*

*namo 'stu buddhāya namo 'stu bodhaye*  
*namo 'stu muktāya namo 'stu muktaye*  
*namo 'stu śāntāya namo 'stu śāntaye*  
*namo vimuktāya namo vimuktaye*  
*ye brāhmaṇā vāhita-pāpa-dharmāḥ*<sup>23</sup>

*ye brāhmaṇā vedagū*  
*sabbadhamme*  
*te me namo te ca maṃ*  
*pālayantu*  
*nam' atthu buddhānaṃ*  
*nam' atthu bodhiyā*  
*namo vimuttānaṃ namo*  
*vimuttiyā.*

*teṣāṃ namas te ca mama pālayantu.*

The *Mahāmāyūri* is a cumulative work that draws on diverse sources, and has parallels in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin *Upasena-sūtra*, and the Theravādin *Mora-jātaka*, *Khandavatta-jātaka* (No. 203), and *Vinaya*.<sup>24</sup> In the present case the prose narrative is close to, or derived from, the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, but the verse, not found in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, resembles a verse of the Pāli *Mora-jātaka*.

Nandapuri

Peter Skilling

<sup>22</sup> *Jātaka* II 34.12.

<sup>23</sup> Cp. Franz Bernhard (ed.), *Udānavarga*, Vol. I (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X), Göttingen, 1965, 33:13a and Radhagovinda Basak (ed. with Bengali translation), *Mahāvastu Avadāna*, Vol. III, Calcutta, 1968, p. 430.13 *yo brāhmaṇo vāhitapāpadharmo; Udāna* 3.20, *Vinaya* I 3.5 *yo brāhmaṇo bāhitapāpadhammo*.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Skilling, "Rakṣā Literature", p. 140.

68/7

## A Note on *Dhammapada* 60 and the Length of the *Yojana*

### I. *Dhammapada* 60 and its counterparts

*Dhammapada* 60 is the first verse of the *Bāla-vagga*, “The Chapter on Fools”. It may be rendered as follows:

Long is the night for one who is sleepless;  
long is the league for one who is weary.  
Long is saṃsāra for the fool  
who does not understand the Good Dhamma.

In the Pāli and Patna *Dhammapadas* the verse is in the *Bālavagga*; in the *Udānavarga* it is in the *Anityavarga*.<sup>1</sup> The first part of the *Anityavarga* of the *Udānavarga* from Subāṣi, which should have contained the verse, is lost,<sup>2</sup> as is the entire *Bālavarga* of the “*Gāndhāri Dharmapada*”, which might have contained the verse.<sup>3</sup> A perfect equivalent to the *Udānavarga* verse is cited in the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* as “a *gāthā* spoken by the Lord”,<sup>4</sup> and lines *c* and *d* are cited in Bhavya’s *Tarkajvālā*, as preserved in Tibetan translation.

<sup>1</sup> The verse is not included in the *Fa chü p’i yü ching* (Taishō 211): see Samuel Beal, *Texts from the Buddhist Canon, Commonly known as Dhammapada, with accompanying Narratives*, [Boston, 1878] San Francisco, 1977, p. 77, and Charles Willemen, *Dharmapada: A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dharmapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*, Brussels, 1974, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Nakatani (ed.), *Udānavarga de Subāṣi*, Paris, 1987, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. John Brough, *The Gāndhāri Dharmapada*, London, 1962, pp. 10–12.

<sup>4</sup> *bhagavatā gāthā bhāṣitā*: Sylvain Lévi, *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La grande classification des actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*, Paris, 1932, p. 46.4; P.L. Vaidya, *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha I* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 17), Darbhanga, 1961, p. 187.9.



Dhp 60 (V,1)	PDhp 185 (XI,12b)	Uv I,19; Mkv 46.4
<i>dīghā jāgarato rattī</i>	<i>drīghā assupato rātrī</i>	<i>dīrghā jāgarato rātrir</i>
<i>dīgham santassa</i>	<i>drīgham śāntassa</i>	<i>dīrgham śrāntasya</i>
<i>yojanam</i>	<i>yojanam</i>	<i>yojanam</i>
<i>dīgho bālānam</i>	<i>drīgho bālāna saṃsāro</i>	<i>dīrgho bālasya</i>
<i>saṃsāro</i>		<i>saṃsārah</i>
<i>saddhammam</i>	<i>saddhammam</i>	<i>saddharmam</i>
<i>avijānatam.</i>	<i>avijānatam.</i> <sup>5</sup>	<i>avijānatah.</i> <sup>6</sup>

UvT I,19

Mkv 189.8

<i>mel tshe byed la mtshan mo riñ//</i>	<i>mel tshe byed na nam yañ riñ//</i>
<i>lam gyis dub la rgyaṅ grags riñ//</i>	<i>nal ba dag la dpag tshad riñ//</i>
<i>dam chos rnam par mi śes pa 'i//</i>	<i>dam pa 'i chos na śes gyur kyañ//</i>
<i>byis pa rnam la 'khor ba riñ//<sup>7</sup></i>	<i>byis pa rnam la 'khor ba riñ//<sup>8</sup></i>

<sup>5</sup> Margaret Cone, "Patna Dharmapada", *JPTS* XIII (1989), p. 185; Gustav Roth, "Text of the Patna Dharmapada", in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen, 1980, p. 114. I prefer "Patna Dhammapada" to "Patna Dharmapada", since *dhamma* is so spelt in the body of the text: *Dharmmapada* occurs only in the Sanskrit colophon. I have proposed elsewhere that the PDhp might be a recension of the Sāmmatiya school: see Peter Skilling, "Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation", *JPTS* XIX (1993), p. 152, n. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Franz Bernhard (ed.), *Udānavarga*, Vol. I, Göttingen, 1965, p. 102.

<sup>7</sup> Siglinde Dietz and Champa Thupten Zongtse, *Udānavarga*, Vol. III, Göttingen, 1990, p. 34.

<sup>8</sup> Lévi's text is based on the Narthang blockprint, compared with the Peking (p. 183, n. 1). I assume that Narthang reads *na*, as given by Lévi. Peking reads here *nī* (Q1005, Vol. 39, *mdo śu*, 291b2). The reading should rather be the negative *mi*.

Tarkajvālā 167.28

*dam chos rnam par mi śes pa 'i// byis pa la ni 'khor ba riñ//<sup>9</sup>*Chinese *Udānavarga* I,18

To him who does not sleep soundly the night seems long. To him who is tired the road seems long. For the fool birth and death are longlasting. Few hear the good law.<sup>10</sup>

Both the Pāli and Patna *Dhammapadas* give *bāla* in the plural, as does the Tibetan of the *Udānavarga* and the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* (in both *byis pa rnam*). The Sanskrit *Udānavarga* (and the Chinese *Udānavarga* in English translation), the Sanskrit *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, and the Tibetan *Tarkajvālā* citation give *bāla* in the singular. The Tibetan *Udānavarga* has *rgyaṅ grags* = *krośa* in place of *yojana*; this is probably a slip of the translators. The *Udānavargavivarāna* and the Tibetan *Mahākarma-vibhaṅga* have *dpag tshad* = *yojana*.

## II. The setting (*nidāna*) of the verse

Prajñāvarman, in his *Udānavargavivarāna*, gives three *nidānas* for the *Udānavarga* verse:<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Shotaro Iida, *Reason and Emptiness: A Study in Logic and Mysticism*, Tokyo, 1980, p. 167.28.

<sup>10</sup> Taishō 213, tr. by Charles Willemsen, *The Chinese Udānavarga: A Collection of Important Odes of the Law, Fa Chi Yao Sung Ching* (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques XIX), Brussels, 1978, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup> UvViv I 98.15–99.10. For the alternate *nidānas* given by Prajñāvarman, see Michael Balk, *Untersuchungen zum Udānavargd*, Bonn, 1988, pp. 205–12 and Skilling, "Theravādin Literature", pp. 143–53.

76/7

(1) When the monks were gathered, seated together in the assembly hall (*bsti gnas kyi khañ pa*),<sup>12</sup> this chance discussion arose: “What, venerable ones, is that which is called ‘long’ (*dirgha*)?” Some said, “The night is long for one who is awake”. Others said, “The *yojana* is long for the weary traveller”. Overhearing [their discussion], the Lord spoke this verse.

(2) According to others: A deity (*deva*) came and asked the Lord:

“What is long for one who is awake?  
What is long for the weary traveller?”

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the stock introduction at *Śayanāsanavastu* (Raniero Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu*, Rome, 1978, p. 3.9 *sambahulānāṃ bhikkhūnāṃ upasthānasālāyāṃ saṃniṣaṇṇānāṃ saṃnipatitānāṃ ayam evaṃrūpo ‘bhūḍ antarākathāsamudāhārah; Kośavyākhyā* (ed. Swami Dwarikadas Shastri, IV 1066, antepenult); introductions to MN 119 and 123 (III 88.18, 118.12) *sambahulānāṃ bhikkhūnāṃ...upaṭṭhānasālāyāṃ sannisinnānāṃ saṃnipatitānāṃ ayam antarākathā udapādi; Karmaprajñapti, Upāyikā-tikā* (see below). It seems that here *bsti gnas kyi khañ pa* = *upasthānasālā* (Pāli *upaṭṭhānasālā*): *bsti stañ* frequently translates forms of *sat-kṛ*, which is one of the senses of *upasthāna*. *upasthānasālā* is frequently rendered as *rim gro’i gnas*, the form sanctioned by the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* (Mvy 5565; MPS 2.1–4; *Vinayavastu, Saṃghabhedavastu*, Q1030, Vol. 42, ‘dul ba ce, 155b7, 156a1, 2 = Raniero Gnoli (ed.), *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṃghabhedavastu*, Part II, Rome, 1978, p. 75.25 foll. ). But there are, for Tibetan, a surprising number of alternates:

*rim ‘gro’i khañ pa* (*Karmaprajñapti*, Q5589, Vol. 115, *mñon pa khu*, 112a3);  
*dpoñ sa’i khañ pa* (*Vinayavibhaṅga*, Q1032, Vol. 42, ‘dul ba je, 1a3, 5, 7, 8 = *Saṃghabhedavastu*, loc. cit.);  
*bkad sa* (MPS 19.1, 2, 4, 5; at Mvy 5562 *bkad sa* = *maṇḍapa*);  
*‘dun khañ* (*Kośavyākhyā*, Q5593, Vol. 117, *mñon pa chu*, 303b7);  
*mdun ma* (*Śamatpadeva, Abhidharmakośopāyikā-tikā*, Q5595, Vol. 118, *mñon pa thu*, 58b6, 59a4);  
*bsñen bkur gyi gnas* (*Śayanāsanavastu*, Q1030, Vol. 41, ‘dul ba ne, 179a5, b5 (*dkur* for *bkur*).

What is long for the fool?  
I beg your answer to these riddles.”

The Lord replied, “Night is long for the wide-awake”, and so on.

(3) Others say that this verse was spoken [by the Lord] with reference to (*ārabhya*) the sleepless King Prasenajit and a weary traveller.

The first *nidāna*, which I will call the “official” one—the *nidāna* transmitted by Prajñāvarman’s school, the (Mūla)Sārvāstivādins—is a summarized version of a stock opening employed in both (Mūla)Sārvāstivādin and Theravādin sūtra literature. The *nidāna* might therefore be drawn from a canonical text. The second *nidāna*, attributed to “others” (*gṛān dag* = *anye*)—that is, another school—may also be canonical, since it resembles the short sūtras in which a deity or other figure approaches the Buddha and asks a riddle in verse, to which the Buddha replies in verse. Such sūtras are common in the *Deva-* and *Devatā-samyuttas* of the *Sagātha-vagga* of the *Samyutta-nikāya*, although no counterpart to Prajñāvarman’s citation is found there or elsewhere in Pāli. The third *nidāna*, also attributed to “others”, resembles the short *nidānas* given at the head of the stories in the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*. For the present verse that text gives the following *nidāna*:<sup>13</sup>

*imam dhammadesanam satthā jetavane viharanto  
pasenadikosalañ c’ eva aññatarañ ca purisaṃ ārabbha kathesi.*

The Teacher gave this religious instruction when he was staying in the Jetavana, with reference to [King] Pasenadi of Kosala and a certain man.

<sup>13</sup> *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, Aññatarapurisa-vatthu*, (Mm) III 100.3; (PTS) II 1.3.

The *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* gives a long story<sup>14</sup> in which King Pasenadi of Kosala, out touring the city, glimpses the wife of “a certain poor man”,<sup>15</sup> becomes infatuated with her, and spends a sleepless night.<sup>16</sup> The reference to “the sleepless King Prasenajit” of the UvViv fits the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* story, but the “weary traveller” does not, since the “certain poor man” of the latter is a resident of the city, and is taken by the King into his service (with a sinister motive). Nonetheless, Prajñāvarman’s reference suggests that, as in other cases, he knew an exegetical tradition on the *Udānavarga/Dharmapada* that was related to that of the Theravādins.

### III. The length of the yojana

The *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*, commenting on the line “long is the league to him that is weary” (*dīgham santassa yojanam*), defines a *yojana* as equal to four *gāvuta*: *yojanan ti yojanam pi catuggāvutamattam eva*.<sup>17</sup> The *Vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā* states that 80 *usabha* are a *gāvuta*, and four *gāvuta* a *yojana*: *asīti usabhāni gāvutam, cattāri gāvutāni yojanam*.<sup>18</sup> The *Abhidhānappadīpikā* adds one more measurement:

<sup>14</sup> (PTS) II 1–19; (Mm) III 100–114; Eugene Watson Burlingame (tr.), *Buddhist Legends*, Part 2 ([1921] London 1979), Part 2, pp. 100–111.

<sup>15</sup> (Mm) III 100.9; (PTS) II 1.12 *aññatarassāpi* (PTS *aññattarassāpi*) *duggatapurisassa bhariyā*.

<sup>16</sup> (PTS) II 5.10, *rañño pi taṃ rattim niddam alabhantassa*; 5.20, *rājā niddam alabhanto*.

<sup>17</sup> (Mm) III 109.20; (PTS) II 13.4.

<sup>18</sup> *Sammohavinodanī nāma Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā*, Nālandā ed. p. 346.19 = PTS ed. p. 343.

*gāvutam usabhāsīti yojanam catuggāvutam  
dhanupañcasatam koso*.<sup>19</sup>

A *gāvuta* is 80 *usabha*, a *yojana* four *gāvuta*;  
a *kosa* is 500 *dhanu*.

The Pāli Text Society’s Dictionary (p. 250a) defines *gāvuta* as “a linear measure, a quarter of a *yojana* = 80 *usabhas*, a little less than two miles, a league”. For *yojana* (p. 559a) it has “a measure of length: as much as can be travelled with *one* yoke (of oxen), a distance of about 7 miles, which is given by Buddhaghosa as equal to 4 *gāvutas*”, referring to the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* definition given above. It does not give *kosa* (p. 230ab) or *dhanu* (p. 335a) in the sense of measurements.

Medhamaṅkara’s *Lokadīpakasāra* gives the relation between *kosa* and *gāvuti*.<sup>20</sup>

*dhanu pañcasatam kosam kosam cattāri gāvutam  
gāvutāni ca cattāri yojanan ti pavuccatīti*.  
500 *dhanu* are a *kosa*, four *kosa* are a *gāvuta*;  
four *gāvuta* are called a *yojana*.

<sup>19</sup> *Phra gambhīr abhidhānappadīpikā ru bacanānukram bhaṣāpālī plae pen thai* (Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya, Bangkok, 2508 [1965]), p. 53, vv. 196cd, 197a.

<sup>20</sup> National Library-Fine Arts Department, *Lōkadīpakasāra*, Bangkok. 2529 [1986], Chap. 7, p. 544.18.

*Lalitavistara*; the former refers to a “Magadhan *yojana*”, the latter to a “Magadhan *krośa*”.<sup>29</sup> In both texts 1000 *dhanu* = 1 *krośa*. The Vaibhāṣika definition given by Daśabalaśrimitra (D 119b5, Q 18a3) is “500 *dhanu* are one *krośa*; eight *krośa* are one *yojana*”. This agrees with the *Abhidharmakośa* (III,87cd, 88a).<sup>30</sup> (Yaśomitra does not add any comments.)<sup>31</sup> Hsüan-tsang (second quarter of the 7th century) gives the same figures.<sup>32</sup> The Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon *Mahāvvyutpatti* (beginning of the 9th century) gives only one measurement, *dhanuḥ pañca śatāni krośaḥ*.<sup>33</sup> In sum:

<sup>29</sup> E.B. Cowell & R.A. Neil (eds.), *The Divyāvādāna*, repr. Delhi, 1987, p. 645.15 *dhanuḥ sahasraṃ ekakrośaḥ, catvāraḥ krośā eko māgadho yojanaḥ* = Q1027, *sTag rna'i rtogs pa brjod pa*, Vol. 40, *mdo ke*, 264b4 *gzu ston la ni rgyaṅ grags gcig go; rgyaṅ grags bzi la ni ma ga dha'i dpag tshad gcig go*; P.L. Vaidya (ed.), *Lalitavistara*, Darbhanga, 1958, p. 104.5 *dhanuḥ sahasraṃ māgadha* (mārgadhvajā, text) *krośaḥ, catvāraḥ krośā yojanam* = Q763, Vol. 27, *mdo ku*, 89b4 *gzu ston la ni yul ma ga dha'i rgyaṅ grags gcigo; rgyaṅ grags bzi la ni dpag tshad gcig go*.

<sup>30</sup> P. Pradhan (ed.), *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, Patna, 1975, 177.4, *pañcaśatāny eṣāṃ krośo 'raṇyaṃ ca tan matam: dhanuṣāṃ pañca śatāni krośaḥ, krośamātram ca grāmādi 'raṇyam iṣṭam, te 'ṣṭau yojanam ity āhuḥ*. See also William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*, [London, 1937] Delhi, 1987: *krośa*, pp. 92b-93a, 261b, 304a, 322a; *yojana*, 197b, and L. Petech, *Northern India according to the Shui-ching-chu*, Rome, 1950, p. 29. For a complete list of measurements, see William Montgomery McGovern, *A Manual of Buddhist Philosophy*, [London, 1923] Lucknow, 1976, pp. 41-43.

<sup>31</sup> Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, Part II, Varanasi, 1971, p. 536.19.

<sup>32</sup> Samuel Beal, *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*, London, 1884 (repr. Delhi, 1981) I 70-71; Thomas Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India (A.D. 629-645)*, London, 1904-5 (repr. New Delhi, 1973) I 141-43.

<sup>33</sup> Mvy 8205.

72/7

500 *dhanu* = 1 *krośa* (Theravāda, Vaibhāṣika, Hsüan-tsang, *Mahāvvyutpatti*);

1000 *dhanu* = 1 *krośa* (*Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna, Lalitavistara*);

4 *krośa* = 1 *yojana* (Prajñāvarman, *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna, Lalitavistara*)

8 *krośa* = 1 *yojana* (Vaibhāṣika, Hsüan-tsang)

16 *krośa* = 1 *yojana* (Theravāda).

Monier-Williams defines a *krośa* as “the range of the voice in calling or hallooing”, a measure of distance (an Indian league, commonly called a Kos = 1000 Daṇḍas = 4000 Hastas = 1/4 Yojana; according to others = 2000 Daṇḍas = 8000 Hastas = 1/2 Gavyūti).<sup>34</sup> He defines a *yojana* as “a stage or Yojana (*i.e.* a distance traversed in one harnessing or without unyoking; esp. a particular measure of distance, sometimes regarded as equal to 4 or 5 English miles, but more correctly = 4 Krośas or about 9 miles; according to other calculations = 2 1/2 English miles, and according to some = 8 Krośas”.<sup>35</sup> His sources thus give some of the definitions used by the Buddhists, but as part of different systems of measurement. Evidently, and naturally enough, a number of systems coexisted, and the definition of the *yojana* varied with time, place, tradition, and context.<sup>36</sup> It could hardly have been a matter of sectarian dispute for the Buddhists, although it may have had some significance in the interpretation of the Vinaya.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, [Oxford, 1899] Delhi, 1976, p. 322b.

<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*, p. 858a.

<sup>36</sup> See A.L. Basham, *The Wonder that was India*, [1967] Calcutta, 1971, pp. 505-6.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. *The Entrance to the Vinaya, Vinayamukha*, Vol. I, Bangkok, 2512/1969, pp. 235-36. The *Lokadīpakasāra* (544.7 foll. = *Cakkavāladīpanī* 207.21 foll.) mentions two types of *yojana*: *brahmādi-yojana* and *bhūmyādi-yojana*. The first, used for cosmic measurements such as the size of the moon,

73/7

A similar verse is found in the *Samkhyāpakāsaka-pakarāṇa*<sup>21</sup> and *Cakkavāladīpanī*.<sup>22</sup>

*dhanu pañcasatam kosam catukosañ ca gāvutam  
gāvutāni pi cattāri yojanan ti pavuccati.*

The same figures are given by Daśabalaśrimitra in Chapter 5 of his *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*, "Analysis of Matter and Time" (*\*Rūpa-kāla-viniścaya*).<sup>23</sup> The chapter gives a brief account of the components of atoms (*paramāṇu*) and of measurements of size from the atom up to the *yojana*, according to the *Vaiḥhāṣikas*. To this the author appends three lines of verse "from the tradition (*āgama*) of the Ārya *Sthavira nikāya*":

*gzu 'dom lña brgya rgyaṅ grags te// rgyaṅ grags bzi la ba lan  
'gros//  
ba lan 'gros bzi dpag tshad do// zes so//*

<sup>21</sup> Boonna Sonchai, *Samkhyāpakāsakapakaraṇam and Commentary: An Edition and Critical Study*, Thesis submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts, Department of Eastern Languages, Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University, 1980, Chap. I, *Addhā-samkhyā*, v. 8 (p. 40). For this text see *Abstracts of M.A. Pāli-Sanskrit Theses* (Pāli and Sanskrit Section, Department of Eastern Languages, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University 2531), pp. 39 (Thai) and 123 (English) and Supaphan na Bangchang, *Vivadhānākār varrnagatī sai phra suttantapīṭak ti daeng nai pradeś thai*, Bangkok, 2533 [1990], pp. 325–33.

<sup>22</sup> National Library-Fine Arts Department, *Cakkavāladīpanī*, Bangkok, 2523 [1980], p. 208.7, with the sole variant *ca* for *pi* in line *c* (= *Lokadīpakasāra*). The *Cakkavāladīpanī* is citing the *Lokadīpakasāra*: the source is given at the beginning of the section (202.11, *vuttam lokadīpakasāre*) after which Sirimaṅgala introduces his citations with *vuttam tatth' eva*. For this text see Supaphan, *op. cit.*, 405–18.

<sup>23</sup> For Daśabala and his *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya* see Peter Skilling, "The *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya* of Daśabalaśrimitra", *Buddhist Studies Review* 4/1 (1987), pp. 3–23.

500 *dhanu* are one *kosa*; four *kosa* are one *gāvuta*;  
four *gāvuta* are one *yojana*.

Although the measurements are the same, the citation does not exactly correspond to any of our sources, since it gives all three measures in three lines. It is closest to the *Lokadīpakasāra* and *Samkhyāpakāsaka* versions. Medhamkara wrote the former at Muttamanagara (Martaban) in Rāmaññadesa in the 14th century. Nāṇavilāsa, author of the latter, was probably a Northern Thai monk from Chiang Saen of the late 15th to early 16th century,<sup>24</sup> while Sirimaṅgala (a student of the preceding, who wrote a commentary on the *Samkhyāpakāsaka*) compiled the *Cakkavāladīpanī* in the kingdom of Lanna (Chiang Mai) in BE 2063 (CE 1520).<sup>25</sup> Since Daśabalaśrimitra probably lived in the 12th or 13th century, his citation is the earliest known source that includes the equation  $4 \text{ kosa} = 1 \text{ gāvuta}$ .<sup>26</sup> The equation is not found in the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, composed by Moggallāna in the Jetavana Monastery at Pulatthipura towards the end of the 12th century.<sup>27</sup>

Non-Theravādin sources give different definitions. Prajñāvarman's *Udānavarga-vivarāṇa* has: "in this case a *yojana* equals a distance of four *krośa*" (*dpag tshad ni 'dir rgyaṅ grags bzi'i lam mo*).<sup>28</sup> The same figure is given in the *Sārdūlakarṇavadāna* and the

<sup>24</sup> Supaphan, *op. cit.*, pp. 325–26.

<sup>25</sup> Supaphan, *op. cit.*, p. 405.

<sup>26</sup> I would not be astonished if more on measurements, including perhaps the figure in question, occurs in the *Ṭikā* literature.

<sup>27</sup> For the date see K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 166–67; Claus Vogel, *Indian Lexicography*, (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. V, Fasc. 4), Wiesbaden, 1979, p. 313; Jinadasa Liyanaratne, "South Asian flora as reflected in the twelfth-century Pāli lexicon *Abhidhānappadīpikā*", *JPTS* XX (1994), p. 43.

<sup>28</sup> I 100.5.

74/7

In Section IV I give a translation, in Section V the Tibetan text, of Chapter 5 of the *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*. Daśabalaśrīmitra's description of atoms agrees with that of the *Indriyanirdeśa* (Chap. 2) of the *Abhidharmakośa*.<sup>38</sup> His enumeration of measurements of size and units of time, both given in ascending order, agrees on the whole with that of the *Lokanirdeśa* (Chap. 3) of the *Abhidharmakośa*.<sup>39</sup> The relative antiquity of the enumerations of size and time is shown by the fact that they are given in the *Lokaprajñapti*, a "canonical" text of the (Mūla)Sārvāstivādin Abhidharma.<sup>40</sup>

The *Vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā* gives a series of ascending measurements of size, starting from the atom.<sup>41</sup> The same figures are

sun, and *vimānas*, is that of Daśabalaśrīmitra's verse. The second, used for the measurement of land, mountains, and physical distance, will be described below.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, Tome I, repr. Brussels, 1971, pp. 143–47. Cf. Padmanabh S. Jaini (ed.), *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṅgāprabhāvṛtti*, Patna, 1977, (text) pp. 65–66, and Y. Karunadasa, *Buddhist Analysis of Matter*, Colombo, 1967, Chapter 8, "Atomism".

<sup>39</sup> See *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, Tome II, pp. 177–80. I am indebted to La Vallée Poussin's valuable notes. Unfortunately the sections of the third chapter of the *Abhidharmadīpa* and its *Vibhāṅgāprabhāvṛtti*, in which the information might have occurred, are lost: see Jaini, p. 115, n. 1.

<sup>40</sup> Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme. Études et matériaux. Cosmologie: Le monde des êtres et le monde-réceptacle. — Vasubandhu et Yaçomitra. Troisième chapitre de l'Abhidharmakośa: Kārikā, Bhāṣya et Vyākhyā. Avec une analyse de la Lokaprajñapti et de la Kāraṇaprajñapti de Maudgalyāyana*, in *Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques et Classe des Beaux-Arts, Mémoires, deuxième série, tome VI, fasc. II*, Brussels, January, 1919, p. 309. For size see *Lokaprajñapti*, Q5587, Vol. 115, *mñon pa khu* 11a7–b2; for time see 54a4.

<sup>41</sup> *Vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā* (Nālandā ed.) 346.5–19 = PTS ed. p. 343; Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli (tr.), *The Dispeller of Delusion (Sammohavinodanī)*, Part II, Oxford, 1991, p. 67.

given in the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, *Lokadīpakasāra*, *Samkhyāpakāsaka*, and *Cakkavāladīpanī*.<sup>42</sup>

36 paramānu = 1 anu  
 36 anu = 1 tājārī  
 36 tājārī = 1 rathareṇu  
 36 rathareṇu = 1 likkhā  
 7 likkhā = 1 ūkā  
 7 ūkā = 1 dhaññamāsa  
 7 dhaññamāsa = 1 aṅgula  
 12 aṅgula = 1 vidatthi  
 2 vidatthi = 1 ratana  
 7 ratana = 1 yaṭṭhi  
 20 yaṭṭhi = 1 usabha  
 80 usabha = 1 gāvuta  
 4 gāvuta = 1 yojana.

The figures and names are quite different from those of the *Vaibhāṣikas*, with the exception of the equations 7 likkhā = 1 ūkā; 7 ūkā = 1 dhaññamāsa; 7 dhaññamāsa = 1 aṅgula, which may be compared with the 7 likṣā = 1 yūka; 7 yūka = 1 yava; 7 yava = 1 aṅgulī-parvan of the *Vaibhāṣika* system (see below).

The *Abhidhānappadīpikā* does not enumerate the units of time. For these we may turn to Medhamkara's *Lokadīpakasāra*.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> *Abhidhānappadīpikā* vv. 194–96; *Lokadīpakasāra* p. 544.10–15; *Samkhyāpakāsaka* Ch. 1, vv. 2–5; *Cakkavāladīpanī* 207, penult.–208.4. Cf. Y. Karunadasa, *op. cit.*, pp. 150–51. According to the *Lokadīpakasāra* and *Cakkavāladīpanī* this is the *bhūmyādi-yojana*.

<sup>43</sup> *Lokadīpakasāra* 546.1. I quote the verse from the *Cakkavāladīpanī* (see following note) because it appears to be corrupt in the *Lokadīpakasāra*.

75/7

*dasakkharā ekaprāṇam chaprāṇaṇi ca vinādikaṃ  
vinādī pañcadasa pādaṃ catupādaṇi ca nādikā  
saṭṭhi nādī ahorattaṃ tiṃsarattekamāsakaṃ  
dvādasamāsakaṃ vassaṃ evaṃ kālaṃ vijāniya.*

10 akkhara are 1 prāṇa;

6 prāṇa are 1 vinādikā;

15 vinādī are 1 pāda;

4 pāda are 1 nādikā;

60 nādī are 1 day-and-night (ahoratta);

30 nights are 1 month (māsa);

12 months are 1 year (vassa).

The verses are cited by Sirimaṅgalācariya in his *Cakkavāladīpanī*, with a prose commentary.<sup>44</sup> The terms *akkhara*, *prāṇa* (or *pāṇa*), *vinādī* / *vinādikā*, *pāda*, and *nādī* / *nādikā* (or *nālikā*) are not listed by the PED in the sense of units of time. Some of the terms are found in non-Buddhist texts.<sup>45</sup>

The study of Buddhist systems of measurements is complex, and we still have much to learn. I hope that further Buddhist sources, whether in Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan, or Chinese, will one day throw more light on the subject, in comparison with Jaina and Brahmanical systems.<sup>46</sup> The present article shows that, while Daśabalaśrimitra followed the Vaiśbhāṣika system of measurement, he was aware that the Sthaviras defined the *yojana* differently.

<sup>44</sup> *Cakkavāladīpanī* 208.15–209.14.

<sup>45</sup> See Louis Renou & Jean Filliozat, *L'Inde classique, Manuel des études indiennes*, II, Hanoi, 1953, p. 735; Basham, *op. cit.*, 506.

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, the measurements listed by the 19th century Tibetan polymath Jamgön Kongtrül Lodrö Tayé (Koṅ sprul Blo gros mtha' yas, 1813–99), in *Myriad Worlds: Buddhist Cosmology in Abhidharma, Kālacakra, and Dzog-chen*, Ithaca, 1995, pp. 158–59 (time); 166–69 (space).

#### IV. "Analysis of Matter and Time": Chapter 5 of the Samskr̥tāsamkr̥ta-viniścaya

##### [1. The components of the atom]

Herein, the subtlest aggregation of matter (*sarvasūksmo hi rūpasamghāṭaḥ*) in the world of sentient beings and the receptacle world (*sattva-bhājana-loka*) is called the atom (*paramāṇu*). That beyond which nothing smaller can be known is the atom.

##### [1.1. The atom in the Sensual Realm (*kāmadhātu*)]

In the Sensual Realm (*kāmadhātu*), without sound and without faculty (*kāmadhātav aśabdako 'nindriyaḥ*), an eight-substance-atom arises (*aṣṭadravyaka utpadyate*). Therein, these are the eight substances (*aṣṭau dravyāṇi*): earth (*pṛthivī*), water (*ap*), fire (*tejas*), wind (*vāyu*), visible-form (*rūpa*), odour (*gandha*), taste (*rasa*), and touchables (*spraṣṭavya*). When sound is added to these, there is a nine-substance-atom (*navadravyaka*). The atom of the body-faculty (*kāyendriya*) comprises nine substances. Therein, the nine substances are the aforementioned eight substances and the body-faculty-substance. When endowed with sound, there is a ten-substance-atom (*daśadravyaka*). The atoms of the other faculties comprise ten substances. Therein, the ten substances are the aforementioned nine substances and the substance of each individual faculty. When endowed with sound, it becomes an eleven-substance-atom (*ekādaśadravyaka*).<sup>47</sup> This is taught:<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> The Sanskrit given in parentheses up to this point is for the most part drawn from *Kośabhāṣya, Indriyanirdeśa*, pp. 52.24–53.8.

<sup>48</sup> The verse is *Kośakārikā* II,22 *kāme 'ṣṭadravyako 'sabdaḥ paramāṇur anindriyaḥ; kāyendriyī navadravyaḥ daśadravyo 'parendriyaḥ*. I cannot explain (and for now ignore) the double negatives of the Tibetan, which do not fit the prose or the *Kośa* verse.

76/7

In the Sensual [Realm] the atom has eight substances without sound and without faculty.

With the body-faculty there are nine substances; with the other faculties there are ten substances.

[1.2. The atom in the Form Realm (*rūpadhātu*)]

Because it is taught that in the Form Realm (*rūpadhātu*) there is neither scent nor taste, the atoms there are made up of six, seven, or eight substances respectively, according to the above-mentioned system: nothing more needs to be explained (*rūpadhātau gandharasayor abhāva uktas tena tatratyāḥ paramāṇavaḥ ṣaṣṭaptāṣṭadravyakā ity uktarūpatvāt na punar ucyante*).<sup>49</sup>

[2. Measurements of size]

In this way, the form that is reached in order of decreasing size, is the atom (*rūpasya apaciyamānasya paryantah paramāṇuḥ*).<sup>50</sup> The first eleven categories of atom, etc., are [multiples of] seven, as follows:<sup>51</sup>

7 *paramāṇu* are 1 *aṇu* (*rdul phran* = Kośa)

Mvy *rdul phra mo*

7 *aṇu* are 1 *loha-rajās* (*lcags*)

<sup>49</sup> The Sanskrit given in parentheses is from *Kośabhāṣya*, *Indriyanirdeśa*, p. 53.17–18.

<sup>50</sup> The Sanskrit given in parentheses is from *Kośabhāṣya*, *Lokanirdeśa*, p. 176.11.

<sup>51</sup> See *Kośabhāṣya*, *Lokanirdeśa*, 176.14–177.7, *ad Kośakārikā* III, 85d–88a; Tibetan equivalents (“Kośa”) from *Kośabhāṣya* Tibetan, Q5591, Vol. 115, *mñon pa gu*, 177b6 foll.; Mvy § CCLI, nos. 8190–8206. See also La Vallée Poussin, *Cosmologie*, pp. 262–63. The list is given in English translation from the Tibetan at Jamgön Kongtrul, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

Mvy, Kośa *lcags rdul*<sup>52</sup>

7 *loha-rajās* are 1 *śāsa-rajās* (*ri boñ*)

Mvy, Kośa *ri boñ rdul*

7 *śāsa-rajās* are 1 *eḍaka-rajās*<sup>53</sup> (*lug*)

Mvy, Kośa *lug rdul*

7 *eḍaka-rajās* are 1 *go-rajās* (*glañ*)

Mvy, Kośa *glañ rdul*

7 *go-rajās* are 1 *vātāyanacchidra-rajās* (*ñi zer*)

Mvy, Kośa *ñi zer* (*gyi*) *rdul*

7 *vātāyanacchidra-rajās* are 1 *rajās* (*rdul*)

Mvy, Kośa —

7 *rajās* are 1 *likṣā* (*sro ma*)

Mvy, Kośa *idem*

7 *likṣā* are 1 *yūka* (*śig*)<sup>54</sup>

Mvy, Kośa *idem*

7 *yūka* are 1 *yava* (*nas*)

Mvy, Kośa *idem*

7 *yava* are 1 *aṅgulī-parvan* (*sor mo tshigs*)

Kośa *sor mo*’i *tshigs*,

Mvy *sor mo*, *sor*

3 *aṅgulī-parvan* are 1 *aṅgulī* (*mdzub mo*)

Kośa *sor mo*; Mvy —

<sup>52</sup> *Kośabhāṣya* and Kongtrul add here 7 *loha-rajās* = 1 *ab-rajās* (Mvy 8193, *Kośa chu rdul*), 7 *ab-rajās* = 1 *śāsa-rajās*, not given by Daśabalaśrimitra.

<sup>53</sup> *avi-rajās*, Mvy 8195.

<sup>54</sup> Also described in the *Kośabhāṣya* as *tad-udbhava* = *de las byuñ ba*: that is, the louse (*yūka*) comes from the louse-egg (*likṣā*).



As for surface measurements:<sup>55</sup>

24 *āṅgulī* are 1 full *hasta* (*khru gaṅ* = Mvy)

Kośa *khru*

4 *hasta* are 1 full *dhanu* (*gzu gaṅ* = Kośa)

Mvy 'dom'<sup>56</sup>

500 *dhanu* are 1 *krośa* (*rgyaṅ grags*)

Mvy, Kośa idem<sup>57</sup>

8 *krośa* are 1 *yojana* (*dpag tshad*)

Mvy, Kośa idem.

According to the tradition (*āgama*) of the Ārya Sthavira *nikāya*, however:

500 *dhanu* are one *kosa*;

4 *kosa* are one *gāvuta*;

4 *gāvuta* are one *yojana*.

### [3. Time (*kāla*)]<sup>58</sup>

The limit of time (*kāla-paryanta*) is the moment (*kṣaṇa*).<sup>59</sup> A moment is described as the time it takes for one atom to pass to another

<sup>55</sup> *logs la gzal bas*: cf. *Kośabhāṣya* p. 176, ult *pārsvīkṛtās tu*; *Kośabhāṣya* Tib. 178a2 *nos su bya na ni*.

<sup>56</sup> *Kośabhāṣya* 177.2 *dhanuḥ, vyāsenety arthaḥ* (*Kośabhāṣya* Tib. 178a2 *khru bži la gzu gaṅ no. 'dom gaṅ no zes bya ba 'i tha tshig go*).

<sup>57</sup> This is the distance of an *aranya*: *Kośakārikā* III, 87cd *krośo 'ranyaṃ ca tan matam* (*Kośabhāṣya* Tib. 178a2 *rgyaṅ grags de la dgon par 'dod*).

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *Divyāvadāna* (*Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*) p. 644; Hsüan-tsang in Beal I 71, Watters I 143–44; La Vallée Poussin, *Cosmologie*, p. 263; Jamgön Kongtrul, *op. cit.*, pp. 168–69. Mvy § CCLIII, *Dus kyi min*, gives a long list of terms related to time.

<sup>59</sup> *Kośabhāṣya* 176.11 *kālasya paryantaḥ kṣaṇo*.

77/7

atom.<sup>60</sup> Alternately, for a strong man to snap his fingers is 65 moments,<sup>61</sup> or, some say, 37. 120 moments are called one *tatkṣaṇa*; 60 *tatkṣaṇa* are one *lava*; 30 *lava* are one *muhūrta*, which is also called a *nālikā*;<sup>62</sup> 30 *muhūrta* are one day-and-night (*ahorātra*); 30 days are one month (*māsa*); 12 months are one year (*saṃvatsara*).<sup>63</sup>

### [4. Chapter colophon]

“Analysis of Matter and Time” (*\*Rūpa-kāla-viniścaya*), Chapter 5 of *The Analysis of the Conditioned and the Unconditioned*, compiled by Mahāpaṇḍita Daśabalaśrimitra.

### V. Tibetan text of Chapter 5 of the Samskṛtāsamkṛta-viniścaya<sup>64</sup>

[1] 'dir sems can dañ snod kyi 'jig rten dag gzugs 'dus pa thams cad kyi phra ba ni rdul phra rab ces (D: *zes* Q) brjod dol/ gaṅ las ches chuñ ba šes par bya ba med pa de ni rdul phra rab po//

[1.1] 'dod pa 'i khams su sgra dañ bral ba dañ dbaṅ po spaṅs pa 'i rdzas brgyad ldan skye bar 'gyur ro// de la rdzas brgyad ni 'di lta ste/ sa dañ/ chu dañ/ me dañ/ rluñ dañ/ gzugs dañ/ dri dañ/ ro dañ/ reg bya 'o// 'di

<sup>60</sup> *Kośabhāṣya* 176.13, *yāvatā paramāṇoh paramānvantaram gacchati*.

<sup>61</sup> *Kośabhāṣya* 176.13 *balavat puruścchatasamghātāmātreṇa pañcaśaṣṭhiḥ kṣaṇā atikrāmantity ābhidhārmikāḥ*. For *puruścchatasamghātāmātreṇa* see Mvy 8226 and *L'Abhidharmakośa* III 178, n. 1.

<sup>62</sup> The term is transliterated as *na-li-ka*.

<sup>63</sup> See *Kośabhāṣya* 177.7–20.

<sup>64</sup> Stobs bcu dpal bšes gñen, 'Dus byas dañ 'dus ma byas nam par nes pa. Q5865, Vol. 146, *no mtshar bstan bcos ño*, 17b3–18a7; D3897, *dbu ma ha*. 119a6–120a2. All variants are recorded except for the use of the *śad* (*danda*), in which there are only two variants—the omission of the *śad* in Q after *dañ* in *dri dañ/ ro dañ/*, as given by D.

mams su sgra rab tu bcug pas rdzas dgu ldan 'gyur ro// lus kyi dbaṅ po'i rdul phra rab ni rdzas dgu (D119b) ldan de/ de la rdzas dgu ni 'di lta ste/ rdzas brgyad po de ñid daṅ lus kyi dbaṅ po'i rdzas so// sgra daṅ bcas pa na rdzas bcu'o// dbaṅ po gžan mams kyi rdul phra rab ni rdzas bcu ldan no// de la rdzas bcu ni 'di lta ste/ rdzas dgu po de ñid daṅ dbaṅ po raṅ raṅ gi rdzas so// sgra daṅ bcas pa na rdzas bcu gcig tu 'gyur ro// gsuṅs te/

'dod na phra rab rdzas brgyad de (D: *æ* Q) // sgra med pa min dbaṅ med min//  
lus dbaṅ ldan la rdzas dgu'o// dbaṅ po gžan ldan rdzas bcu'o//<sup>65</sup>

[1.2] 'dis ni gzugs kyi khams na dri daṅ ro dag med par gsuṅs pa des na/ de dag na ni rdul phra rab dag ni rim pa bžin du rdzas drug daṅ bdun brgyad do žes gsuṅs pa'i tshul ñid kyis na ci yaṅ brjod par mi bya'o//

[2] de ltar gzugs 'di ñid kyi 'grib bžin pa na mthar thug pa ni rdul phra rab po// rdul phra (Q18a) rab la sogs pa'i sgra bcu gcig ni/ goṅ ma bdun 'gyur te/ 'di lta ste/ rdul phra rab bdun la rdul phran no// rdul phran bdun la lcags so// lcags bdun la ri boṅ no// ri boṅ bdun la lug go// lug bdun la glaṅ no// glaṅ bdun la ñi zer ro// ñi zer bdun la rdul lo// rdul bdun la sro ma'o// sro ma bdun la śig go// śig bdun la nas so// nas bdun la sor mo'i tshigs so// sor mo'i tshigs gsum la mdzub mo'o// logs la gžal (D: *bžal* Q) bas/ sor mo ñi śu bži la khru gaṅ no// khru bži la gžu gaṅ no// gžu lña brgya la rgyaṅ grags so// rgyaṅ grags brgyad (Q: *brgya* D) la dpag tshad do// 'phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i luṅ las kyaṅ/

<sup>65</sup> Cp. *Kośārikā* II,22 at *Kośabhāṣya* Tibetan 70b3 foll.:

'dod na dbaṅ po med pa daṅ//  
sgra med phra rab rdul rdzas brgyad//  
lus dbaṅ ldan la rdzas dgu'o//  
dbaṅ po gžan ldan rdzas bcu'o//.

gžu 'dom lña brgya rgyaṅ grags te// rgyaṅ grags bži la ba laṅ 'gros//  
ba laṅ 'gros bži dpag tshad do// žes so//

[3] dus kyi mtha' ni skad cig ma ste/ de yaṅ dus ci srid du rdul phra rab kyis rdul phra rab gžan brgal bar gyur pa de srid kyi dus la skad cig ces (D: *žes* Q) bya'o// yaṅ na stobs daṅ ldan pa'i skyes bus se gol gtogs pa tsam la skad cig ma drug cu rtsa lña'o// sum cu rtsa bdun žes pa yaṅ no// skad cig brgya ñi śu la de'i skad cig ces (D: *žes* Q) so// de'i skad cig drug cu la thaṅ cig (D: *gcig* Q) go// thaṅ cig (D: *gcig* Q) (D120a) sum cu la yud tsam mo// na-li-ka žes kyaṅ brjod do// yud tsam sum cu la ñin žag go// ñin žag (D: *žags* Q) sum cu la zla ba'o// zla ba bcu gñis la lo 'khor ba'o//

[4] paṅdi-ta (D: *mkhas pa* Q) chen po stobs bcu dpal (Q adds *gyi*) bšes gñen kyis bsdus pa (D: *pa'i* Q) 'dus byas daṅ 'dus ma byas mam par ñes pa las gzugs daṅ dus mam par ñes pa žes bya ba l'eu lña pa'o//

Nandapuri

Peter Skilling

### Abbreviations

D	Derge (sDe dge) bsTan 'gyur
<i>Kośabhāṣya</i>	P. Pradhan (ed.), <i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu</i> , 2nd rev. ed., Patna, 1975
Mm	Siamese script Mahāmakutaṛājavidyālaya (Bangkok) edition
MPS	Ernst Waldschmidt (ed.), <i>Das Mahāparinirvānasūtra</i> , 3 parts, [Berlin, 1950–51] Kyoto, 1986
Mvy	R. Sakaki, <i>Mahāvvyutpatti</i> , Kyoto, 1926
PTS	roman script Pali Text Society edition

79/7

170

Peter Skilling

Q Peking (Qianlong) bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur  
Uv *Udānavarga*  
UvViv Michael Balk, *Prajñāvarman's Udānavar gāvivarāṇa*,  
2 vols., Bonn, 1984

## Additions to the Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Dr Allen Thrasher of the Library of Congress called my attention to a few manuscripts that have come to (or back to) the Southeast Asia Section since I made the list published in JPTS XIII, pp. 1-31. This has made it possible to correct some entries and add new ones. There have also been a number of new palm-leaf manuscripts given to the library. Burmese-Pāli 129-153 were given by E. Gene Smith in 1993. They were bought in Thailand. Burmese-Pāli 158 and 159 were given by Mrs Mildred Goldthorpe. Burmese-Pāli 160 is an illustrated manuscript on paper recently acquired by the library.

William Pruitt

### Abbreviations

- Barnett L.C. Barnett, *A Catalogue of the Burmese Books in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1913).
- Bode M.H. Bode, *The Pali Literature of Burma* (Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1909, repr. 1966).
- Bur MSS I Heinz Bechert, Daw Khin Khin Su, Daw Tin Tin Myint, compilers, *Burmese Manuscripts, Part 1* (Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1979).
- Bur MSS I Heinz Braun, Daw Tin Tin Myint, compilers, *Burmese Manuscripts, Part 2* (Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1985).
- PL K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983).

80/7

## Pali, Pāṇini and "Popular" Sanskrit

(Miscellanea Palica VI)

Though it has never been doubted that non-standard Sanskrit (or *sanskrit approximatif*, as Helmer Smith [1954: 3] called it) as evidenced by the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas is of prime importance for the study of the history of Pali and other Middle Indo-Aryan languages, the Pali grammar of Geiger – and the same holds true for the Prakrit grammar of Pischel – does not make any reference to Epic or Purāṇic Sanskrit forms. Just as little attention has been paid to the relation of Pali (and Middle Indo-Aryan in general) to late Vedic and Sanskrit as described by Pāṇini. On the other hand, scholars discussing specific forms and constructions of late Vedic, of Epic and Purāṇic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini's grammar have rarely taken into account corresponding Middle Indian phenomena. A few selected examples – in the main syntactical and lexical problems – will be discussed to show that the interlinking of the linguistic study of Pali, of Epic and Purāṇic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini will not only help us to achieve a better understanding of the development of the Indo-Aryan languages, but will also prove fruitful for the better comprehending of what the texts actually tell us.

---

\* The author wishes to express his gratitude to the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* for granting a *Heisenberg-Stipendium*. This enabled him to write this paper, which is the outcome of an extensive investigation of Epic Sanskrit, the results of which will be published as a "Grammar of Epic Sanskrit" (in *Indian Philology and South Asian Studies* [ed. by A. Wezler and M. Witzel]). My thanks are also due to Professor O. von Hinüber, who read an earlier version of this paper and made valuable suggestions. Needless to say, I am responsible for any faults this article may contain.

I use the abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts laid down in the *Epilegomena* to Volume I of *A Critical Pali Dictionary*.

## 1.1. Instrumental in place of locative

One syntactical feature shared by Pali, Prakrit and non-standard Sanskrit is the usage of the instrumental<sup>1</sup> in place of the locative<sup>2</sup>. It will be seen that the consideration of the same phenomenon in Epic Sanskrit on the one hand, and in Prakrit on the other, will help us to assess one of Lüders' hypotheses relating to the "eastern" proto-canonical Buddhist language. Lüders postulated a locative in °*ehi* for the "eastern" language, since a couple of Pali stanzas use a form in °*ehi* where we would expect a locative (1954: § 220-225; cf. von Hinüber § 321)<sup>3</sup>. But it is well known that, in the syntax of Epic Sanskrit, the salient feature is the interchangeability of different cases in construction with verb forms. This "confusion" of cases was due to the incipient break-down of the inflexional system, which again led to the employment of a large number of post-positions. The same phenomenon is encountered in Middle Indo-Aryan where – e.g. in the feminine noun inflection (cf. Insler 1994: 70) –

<sup>1</sup> I regret that I do not have access to Sukumar Sen, "The use of the instrumental in Middle Indo-Aryan", PAIOC V (Summaries) 44-48 (according to the PAIOC index it has been published in *Indian Linguistics* 8 – however, it is not to be found there).

<sup>2</sup> Due to my regrettable ignorance of any Dravidian language I do not know whether (or not) and (if so) to what extent such a phenomenon is due to the influence of Dravidian. To judge from the investigations of De Vreese (1953, 1980), "Dravidisms" in Pali only appear rather late.

<sup>3</sup> In the report on his investigations into the Buddhist "Urkanon", originally published in SBAW 1927, p. 123, and reprinted in Lüders 1954: 8, Lüders explicitly speaks of the "Lok. pl. auf -*ehi*" (cf. also von Hinüber 1968: § 307). And he considers this form as a *peculiarity of the nominal inflexion* of the "Ostsprache" and *not* of the syntax of that language: "Auch in der Flexion zeigen sich manche Unterschiede. Wichtig ist besonders, daß der Akk. Pl. der *a*-Stämme auf -*am* ausging, der Lok. pl. auf -*ehi*" (l.c.). Lüders' reasoning, in establishing this ending, is as simple as it is in the case of the "ablative" in °*am* (cf. de Vreese 1955: 370): some verbs are normally construed with the locative; if we find a form in °*ehi* in one of these constructions it has to be a locative; and because we do find it we have a locative in °*ehi*.

the paradigms were reduced to an opposition between *casus rectus* (nom. and acc.) and *casus obliquus*. Thus, in all kinds of non-standard Sanskrit, the instrumental can be used where we would normally expect the locative:

*cito 'gnir udvahan yajñam pakṣābhyām tān prabādhat* "The piled-up fire that carries up the sacrifice frustrates them on both sides", Mbh 3.210.17<sup>4</sup>

*makarasya tu tuṅḍe vai karṇo rājan vyavasthitaḥ / netrābhyām śakuniḥ śūra ulūkaś ca mahārathaḥ* "O king! Karṇa is standing in the mouth of [the army, which is arrayed in the form of a] makara, while the heroic Śakuni and Ulūka, the great warrior, are placed in its eyes", Mbh 8,7.15 (v.l. *netrayoḥ* [cf. critical notes ad loc.])

*dvihi kulehi ... bodhisattvā jāyanti, kṣatriyakule brāhmaṇakule vā* "The Bodhisattvas are born in two kinds of families, either in the family of a Kṣatriya or in the family of a Brāhmaṇa", Mvu I,197.12<sup>5</sup>

*... sūlena protaḥ* "He was impaled on a stake", Prabhācandra's *Ārādhana-kathā-prabandha* 45,10<sup>6</sup>, corresponding to *sūle protaḥ*, Nemidatta's *Ārādhana-kathākośa* 23.9, and to *śūlikāyām niveśitaḥ*, Hariṣena's *Bṛhatkathākośa* 62.12 (cf. *sūle protaḥ purāṅarṣir acoraś corasankayā*, Mbh 1,57.77, *sūle protaḥ*, I,101.11)

There may be a slight semantic difference between the *instrumentalis (loci)* and the locative proper (cf. Wijesekera 1993:

<sup>4</sup> Most probably it is this stanza that Sen had in mind when he maintained that *pakṣābhyām* is used in the Mahābhārata for the locative (1958: 25) – but unfortunately without giving a reference.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. BHS 7.32, where further examples are cited (cf. § 7.30-31 and 7.34).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Upadhye 1974: 21.

§ 166e), but on the whole both cases are interchangeable<sup>7</sup>, as the *variae lectiones* show<sup>8</sup>. Thus the locative and the instrumental can be used in coordination: *dvau putrau vinatā vavre kadrūputrādhikau bale / ojasā tejasā caiva vikrameṇādhikau sutau* "Vinatā chose two sons who were to exceed Kadrū's sons in strength and to excel them in brilliance, beauty, and might", Mbh 1,14.8<sup>9</sup>.

In this respect, the fact that the Epic poets partly used the instrumental and partly the locative to convey what is evidently the same meaning is very instructive. Compare e.g. a) *durmantritena* vs. *durmantrite* b) *durnayaiḥ* vs. *durnaye* c) *prayojanam* + instr. vs. + loc.<sup>10</sup>:

<sup>7</sup> Usually the locative is used to denote the asterism "at (/ under) which" something takes place, but occasionally the instrumental is, as already stated by Pāṇ 2.3.45 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 78 rem. 2; Hopkins [1903: 5] remarks that "the instrumental is regularly used with the words *puṣya-* and *tiṣya-*"). Thus we come across sentences like *mārgaśirṣyām atīṭyām puṣyeṇa prayayus tataḥ*, Mbh 3,91.25, *puṣyeṇa samprayāto 'smi śravaṇe punar āgataḥ*, Mbh 9,33.5 or *kṣībhāgī bhaven martyaḥ kurvañ śrāddham punarvasau / puṣṭikāmo 'tha puṣyeṇa śrāddham iheta mānavah*, Mbh 13,89.4.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *utsaṅgena vyāla ivāhrto 'si* "You are like a snake which we took with (= into) our lap", Mbh 2,57.3 (v.l. *utsaṅge nu / ca*), *sa tad ājñāya duṣṭātmā pitur vacanam apriyam / nirāsaḥ sarvakalyāṇaiḥ śocan paryapatam mahim* "Hearing these unfriendly words of his father the wicked [Aśvatthāman], despairing of obtaining every kind of prosperity, began in grief to wander over the earth", Mbh 10,12.10 (v.l. *\*kalyāṇe* [cf. critical notes ad loc.]). The word *nirāsa-* is frequently construed with the locative (*nirāsāni svajīvite*, Mbh 4,58.13, *nirāsa jīvite 'bhavan*, 5,48.47, *tau nirāsau madarthe*, Rāmāyaṇa 5,35.61), but also with other cases (cf. PW s.v. [where, however, no example for the instrumental is given]).

<sup>9</sup> Most probably Pisani (1946: 188) is wrong to contend that *tasmin* is related to *pañitena* in the sentence *tataḥ sāvī vinatā tasmin pañitena parājītā* "Then Vinatā was defeated in that bet", Mbh 1,20.3. It must be construed with *pañitena*: "... was defeated in the bet on that [horse]".

<sup>10</sup> The cases multiply when we go into the manuscripts, as can be seen from Kulkarni's investigation of the case variations in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata (1946: 83, 96, 103-104, 114-115, 134, 149, 172, 187, 200, 215).

82/7

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (a)   | (a)   |
| - <i>sa śete niṣṭanan bhūmau vātarugna iva drumah / mama durmantritenāsau yathā nārhaḥ sa bhārata</i> , Mbh 6,15.15 | - <i>sa śete niṣṭanan bhūmau vātarugna iva drumah / tava durmantrite rājan yathā nārhaḥ sa bhārata</i> , Mbh 6,14.13                          |
| - <i>bhīmo bhīma balo rājams / tava durmantritena ha</i> , Mbh 7,90.24  | - <i>tava durmantrite rājan / sa putrasya viśāṃ pate</i> , Mbh 7,107.31   |
| - <i>saṃsmṛtya sarvaduḥkhāni / tava durmantritena ca</i> , Mbh 7,162.52   | - <i>tava durmantrite rājan / sahaputrasya bhārata</i> , Mbh 9,16.85  |
| - <i>kṣatriyā nidhanam yānti / karṇa durmantritena ca</i> , Mbh 6,92.7  | - <i>rājan durmantrite tava</i> , Mbh 6,58.19 = 7,80.31 = 122.88 = 127.26 = 157.12 = 8,40.6 = 40.129 = 9,15.37 = 22.41 = 22.71                |
| (b)   | (b)   |
| - <i>vinaṣṭān kauravān manye / mama putrasya durnayaiḥ</i> , Mbh 7,108.7  | - <i>avyūhatārjuno vyūham / putrasya tava durnaye</i> , Mbh 8,32.3 (cf. [ambike] <i>tava putrasya / durnayāt kila bhārataḥ</i> , Mbh 1,119.9) |
| (c)   | (c)   |
| - <i>bheṣajaiḥ kiṃ prayojanam</i> , Mbh 12,137.52   | - <i>papracchāgamane hetum aṭane ca prayojanam</i> , Mbh 3,89.3   |
|   | - <i>na me prayojanam kiṃcid gamane pannagāṣana</i> , Mbh 5,110.15  |

83/7

- *na hi me vidyate sūta jīvite 'dya prayojanam*, Mbh 6-73.26
- *gārhaspatye kiṃ prayojanam*, Mbh 12.261.4
- *vacane kiṃ prayojanam*, Mbh 12.308.127
- (cf. *yadā jīvitena prayojanam*, Pañcatantra 162,6, 256,12 [PW s.v.])
- *jīvite ca prayojanam*, Mbh 13,54.39
- *jīvite 'sti prayojanam*, R (Bomb.) 4,1.31
- *gamane kiṃ prayojanam*, R (Bomb.) 5,60.6
- (d)
- (cf. *na ca me ... jīvitena kṛtyam*, Mṛcchakaṭīka 154,3)
- (d)
- *bhoḥ kim āgamane kṛtyam* "What is the use of coming", Mbh 13,41.14

As far as (d) *āgamane* is concerned, the sequence *°ane<na>* (preceded by another nasal!) may have led to the loss of the syllable *na* by haplology (cf. AiGr. III § 32bα)<sup>11</sup>. This haplological loss may account for the cases where a locative and an instrumental are coordinated:

<sup>11</sup> The same holds true for *anaśane<na>* in the sentence *dehaṃ vānaśane tyaktvā sa svargam samupāśnute* "Having died by fasting he reaches heaven", Mbh 13,130.47 – unless we are to translate "having died in fasting". This feature is to be found in Pali too: (*gāmehi nigamehi vā raṭṭhe<hi> (janapadehi vā)*, Ja VI 294,27\*, *vasanehi anūpame<hi>*, Thī 374 (cf. Bechert 1955: 13 n. 25). This explanation (on which cf. Norman, transl. p. 138) is certainly to be preferred to Pischel's: "*anūpame* is instr. plur." (Thī-ed. p. 209). Cf. *mamaṃ rodantiyā sati<yā>*, Ja VI 188,2\* (*rodamānāyā sati*yā, ct.).

*sudhanvan vipaṇe<na> tena praśṅgaṃ pṛcchāva ye viduḥ* "With that stake we shall ask the question of those who know", Mbh 5,35.13, *sainyena rajasāvṛte<na>* "by the dust of the army which covered [everything]", Mbh 9,16.77 = 20.31 = 22.48 = 28.12, *sainyena rajasā dhvaste<na>* (*nirmaryādam avartata*) "by the dust of the army which was scattered [all around]", Mbh 7,73.53 (cf. *sainye ca rajasā dhvaste nirmaryādam avartata*, 7,31.33)

In some cases, however, we only find the locative used where we would expect the instrumental: *vāsudevasyānumate* "With the consent of Vāsudeva", Mbh 1,2.92. And *anumate* is much too frequent<sup>12</sup> to be explained by such a "sporadic" phenomenon as syllabic haplology (even if we take it as a generalized form). It may represent an (abbreviated) *locativus absolutus*: *anumate (sati)* "when there is consent", which exactly amounts to "with the consent (of)". And it is this feature – (abbreviated) *locativus absolutus* = instrumental – which may have contributed to the further merging of both cases. Consequently we not only encounter the *locativus absolutus* but also an *instrumentalis absolutus* (cf. BHS § 7.34, Upadhye 1943: 100):

*kṛṣṇena samupetena jahṛṣe bhāratam puram* "When Kṛṣṇa arrived, the city of the Bhāratas burst out shouting with joy", Mbh 2,30.15 (cf. *anyaiḥ samṛddhair apy arthair na sūtād vidyate param* "For surely, a son prevails, and nothing prevails

<sup>12</sup> *anumate* "with the consent of" is attested in the following places of the epics: Mbh 1,54.11, 77.2, 96.4, 99.17, 108.18, 124.3, 150.3, 196.11, 199.50, 3.7.17, 117.13, 161.14, 267.13, 281.79, 5,31.16, 32.6, 47.2, 171.4, 7,66.2, 102.81, 102.83, 152.11, 9,16.10, 31.29, 12,5.7, 31.41, 274.15, 274.20, 321.13, 13,34.27, 14,26.13, 51.53, 15,13.7, 13.8, 13.16, 25.13, R 1,61.23, 66.24, 67.6, 2,38.7, 69.14.

over a son", Mbh 3,10.5, *punyāhaghoṣair vimalair vedānām ninadais tathā / deveṣu caiva vyagreṣu tasmin yajñavidhau tadā*, Mbh 9,37.6 [v.l. G M °ghoṣe vipule ... ninade (cf. crit. notes ad loc.)].

Since no one will maintain that any of all these forms in *-ena* or *-aiḥ / -ebhiḥ* is any case other than an instrumental, I do not see why *dantehi* in the following sentences should be considered as a locative (as is done by von Hinüber § 321, and id. 1968: § 307)<sup>13</sup>: *ajinamhi haññate dīpī nāgo dantehi haññati* "The leopard is killed for his skin, the elephant for his tusks", Ja VI 78,17\* (*ajinamhi haññate dīpī / nāgo dantehi haññati / dhanamhi dhanino hanti aniketam asanthavam*, Ja VI 61,4\*)<sup>14</sup>.

Turning to the Prakrits, we meet with the same phenomenon of the – at least partial – interchangeability of instrumental and locative<sup>15</sup>: *eēhi muñi sayanehiṃ samaṇa āsi patelasa vāse* "The sage [and] monk dwelt for thirteen years in those resting-places" (Āyāraṅgasutta 1.9.2.4), *Lādhehi tassa uvasaggā bahave* "He had many difficulties in Lādha" (l. c. 1.9.3.3). It is a characteristic feature of the language of Vimalasūri's

<sup>13</sup> We can single out at least one of Lüders' in any case rather few examples: *kāmesu ve haññare bajjhare ca / kāmesu dukkham ca bhayaṃ ca jātaṃ / kāmesu bhūtādhipatī pamattā / pāpāni kammāni karonti mohā*, Ja IV 312,27\*-30\* (~ Jāt-m 114,17\*-20\*). Here Lüders' explanation of *kāmesu* is certainly wrong. The poet started the stanza with *kāmesu*, a *nimitta-saptamī* – as the Indian grammarians call it –, and as he obviously wished to repeat *kāmesu* for the sake of emphasis, he used in pāda b and c the (shortened) *locativus absolutus kāmesu (santesu)* "when (there are) desires".

<sup>14</sup> As is well known (Kielhorn 1898: 18-19 [= Kl. Sch. p. 295-296]) a quite similar stanza is found in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*: *carmaṇi dvīpinaṃ hanti dantayor hanti kuñjaram* (I 458,18).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Ghatage 1937 and 1941: § 372, Upadhye 1944: 53; cf. also Paumacariya, Vol. I (Prakrit Text Society 6, Varanasi 1962), p. 33.

Paumacariya: *ambaratalena vaccai*, 8.42<sup>16</sup>. But it is here that "the locative is regularly used for the instrumental" (Ghatage 1937: 56, cf. id. 1953: 116): *nāñāvīha-pāyavesu samchannā* "covered with trees of various sorts" (Paumacariya 17.29 [reading of J, the oldest ms. available<sup>17</sup>]), *karemi mahilāsu saha nehaṃ* "I make love with the women" (ibid. 108.39). This merging of instrumental and locative was completed in Apabhraṃśa, as is well known: "Der Verwendungsbereich des loc. ist [im Apabhraṃśa] gegenüber dem Pkt. stark erweitert. ... Der loc. tritt häufig ein für den instr. Die Verwechslung geht nach Jacobi (San. § 14) vom plur. aus, wo beide Kasus schon früh lautlich und begrifflich zusammengefallen sind. So dient der loc. auch im sing. gleichzeitig als instr. bei den femininen A- und I-Stämmen. Für die Verwendung des loc. sing. der masc. und neutr. A-Stämme als instr. bietet Bh[avisatta Kaha] (S. 34\* Anm. 1) 27, San[atukumāracaritam] (§ 14) 3 Belege. Im Kum[ārapālpratibodha] finden wir 15 instr. auf -i" (Alsdorf 1928: 64; cf. Singh 1980: 52, Bhayani 1953: 63).

Taking into account all these facts I see no reason why the Pali phenomenon should be treated quite differently. Here, too, it is a matter of *syntax* and *not of morphology*. A sentence like ... *titthehi ... assaṃ pāyehi*, Ja I 185,3\*, has its counterpart in *bhuñjate rukmapātrībhiḥ* "They eat on (/from) golden plates", Mbh 2,45.18 (cf. Meenakshi 1983: 72).

## 1.2. Pali/Prakrit and Epic-Purāṇic Sanskrit

Popular Sanskrit, as evidenced by both Epics and the Purāṇas, and Middle Indo-Aryan also share a number of grammatical and lexical features. Some of them are very frequently attested both in the Epics and

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Jacobi 1918: 60\*, Upadhye 1944: 153.

<sup>17</sup> See Paumacariya, vol. II, p. XVI.



Purāṇas and in the Theravāda canon: the gen. pl. in (Skt.) °inām and °ūnām resp. (P.) °inaṃ and °ūnaṃ (cf. Geiger § 83.8<sup>18</sup>), the same form to denote the nom. and the acc. pl. in the feminine ī-declension(s), in the ṛ-declension (of words signifying personal relations) and in the n-declension, the acc. pl. (Skt.) gāvah resp. (P.) gāvo (cf. Geiger § 88.3), the generalization of the weak stem (Skt.) viduṣ- resp. (P.) vidū- (cf. Geiger § 100.2), the transfer of stems from one declension to another one (leading to the merging of [masc.] ī- and in-declensions and of feminine ī- and ī-declensions and to the emergence of new words like *apsarā-* / *accharā-* [etc.]), the genitives (Skt.) *mahyam* and *tubhyam* resp. (P.) *mayhaṃ* and *tuyhaṃ* (etc.). Some of them, however, are only sporadically encountered, such as:

- certain normalizations within the pronominal inflexion: loc. sg. fem. (Skt.) *paścimasyām* (cf. R 1,60.3 v.l., 4,36.3, Hariv. 93,15<sup>19</sup>), analogical to other pronouns denoting cardinal points (cf. AiGr. III § 268f); vice versa, (P.) *uttarāya[m]*<sup>20</sup> (beside *uttarassaṃ disāyaṃ*, SN I 148,4\*/6\* [Geiger § 113.8; cf. AiGr. III § 267aα]).
- *viṃśat-* instead of °*viṃśati-* and °*triṃśati-* instead of *triṃśat-*<sup>21</sup>.
- ordinal number instead of cardinal number: (Skt.) *ekaviṃśaś ca daśa ca*, Mbh 12,308.112, *caturviṃśaṃ putraśataṃ babhūva*,

<sup>18</sup> There are more examples: *pāṇinaṃ*, Th 1258, *sivinaṃ*, Ja IV 405,24\* (C\* *sivinaṃ* [faulty metre]), *abandhunaṃ*, Th 240, Ap 323,22 (cf. CPD s.v. *abandhu*).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Brhatkathākośa 71.1, 99.53 (Upadhye 1943: 97).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. *uttara* (DN I 153,19, Ap 541,5, Ja V 43,11' [commenting on *uttariyaṃ disāyaṃ*, 42,21\*]). Cf. JM. *uttarāyaṃ disāyaṃ*, Vasudevahiṇḍi 280.27 (cf. 310.22 and 323.18).

<sup>21</sup> Pali *vīsa(m)*- (Sn 1019, It 99, Ja V 36,22), Skt. (°)*viṃśat-* (Mbh 1,2.199 v.l., 1,180\*, R 6,55.7; in compounds: *viṃśadbhuja-*, R 3,30.8, 3,33.9 v.l., *viṃśadbāhu-*, R 7,32.49, *viṃśadyojana-*, R 5,1.145), Pali (*chat*)*triṃśati-* (Dhp 339), Skt. *triṃśati-* (Mbh 6,57.12, 12,103.20, R 6,55.7 v.l., 6,96.14 v.l.).

Mbh 1,90.39, *viṃśabhuja-*, R 7,9.22 v.l., (P.) *pañcamehi bandhanehi*, SN IV 201,22, 202,9 (Geiger § 118.4).

- the accusative of the enclitic form of the pronouns in place of the nominative / vocative<sup>22</sup>.
- the usage of *asmi* in the sense of *aham*<sup>23</sup>.
- misplaced *iti* in direct speech (cf. Pisani 1934: 74-75)<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> (P.) nom. *vo*, Ja VI 576,29\*, Mil 19.4, Mhv I 14,3 (cf. Oberlies 1995: 143; for BHS cf. BHSG § 20.44, for JM. Alsdorf 1935/37: 331 = Kl. Sch. p. 68 [*jeṇaṃ vo samaṇeṇaṃ mahājānamajjhe ohāmiyā taṃ pacchannaṃ jīviyāo vavaroveha*, Vasudevahiṇḍi 88.21]), voc. *vo*, Vin I 23,21/25, nom. *no*, Ja VI 578,20\* (cf. CPD I/531 [sub (ḍ)], Bechert 1958: 312; for BHS cf. BHSG § 20.39), (Skt.) *etāṃ buddhiṃ samāsthāya karṣītau vām mayā kṣudhā* "Having come to that decision both of you grew lean by me, hunger", Mbh 13,55.19 (cf. AiGr. III § 236bβ rem.).

<sup>23</sup> This usage is rather often encountered in the Prakrits (cf. Pischel §417, Alsdorf 1935/37: 326-327 [= Kl. Sch. pp. 63-64], Upadhye 1944: 52 [where Dhūrtākhyāna II.2, IV.2/4 is concerned]). It seems to be very rare in Pali: *saṃhaṭṭhalomo avacasmī bhīto* (for *avac<aṃ> asmi*), "I said", Ja V 165,27\* (cf. Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 162), *saṃviggo 'mhi tadā āsiṃ*, Ap 195,7 (CPD I/529, col. a, ll. 33-35; cf. Bechert 1958: 312). The same holds true for Epic Sanskrit: *eṣo 'smi hanmi saṃkalpaṃ* "I frustrate your plans", Mbh 8,12.34 v.l. (CE *eṣo 'sya hanmi*). In Purāṇic Sanskrit, however, it becomes much more frequent (I take the examples from Pathak 1969: 126): *vicarāmy asmi*, Skandapurāṇa II 5.21, *asmi vasāmi*, Skandapurāṇa II 32.165 (cf. *pibasy asi*, Skandapurāṇa II 40.88 [cf. Vāmana 5,2.82 (PW VII/1705)]). And we know this usage also from works written in "Classical" Sanskrit: *avocam asmi*, Buddhacarita 1.67, *nṛmāmsam asmi vikrīṇe*, Kathāsaritsāgara 25.187, Bodhicaryāvatāra 3.7, cf. Mallinātha ad Kirātārjunīya 3.6: *asmīty aham-arthe 'vyayam* (cf. PW I/536 n. \*).

<sup>24</sup> (P.) *Bhāradvājo +ti bhāsati*, Sn 596; (Skt.) *abrapid iti māṃ bhīṣma vacanaṃ prītivardhanaṃ / ahaṃ priyatamaḥ putraḥ*, Mbh 1,122.28, *praviśya tad veśma mahārathānām ity abrapid draupadiṃ rājaputrim*, Mbh 2,60.19, *ity evam ārtah paridevayan saḥ / rājā kurūṇāṃ nakulaṃ babhāse*, Mbh 10,10.26, *tīrthayātrā sāmudre vaḥ kāryeti puruṣarṣabhāḥ*, Mbh 16,3.22, *sa putram ekam rājyāya pālayeti niyujya ca / prthivīm kṣatradharmaṇa vanam evānvapadyata*, R 1,54.11 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 495), *śūsrāva ca vacas teṣāṃ ... hatāḥ sma khalu ye neha*

- the use of the masculine participle in construction with a feminine noun: *obhāsayaṃ vanam rammaṃ ... kā vā tvam asi kalyāṇi*, Ja V 89,24\*, ... *sā khujjā ... evaṃ dubbhāsitaṃ bhanam*, Ja V 299,2\* (cf. Oberlies 1995: 109 s.v. *anibbisam*); *vārṣṇeyaṃ tu tato bhaimī sāntvayañ ślakṣṇayā girā*, Mbh 3,57.11 (cf. ... *tato rājā sāntvayañ ślakṣṇayā girā*, 1,92.30, *tathā ṛṣir uvācainam sāntvayañ ślakṣṇayā girā*, 1,166.5), *nirikṣamāṇā ... munivaco smaran*, Mbh 3,280.32, *sā dṛṣtvā kṛṣṇam āyāntam ... pṛthāpārthān anusmaran*, Mbh 5,88.2.

The peculiarities of the verbal system common to Pali and non-standard Sanskrit are even more striking. Let me cite just one example, namely the “wrong” and “misplaced” addition of the augment: (P.) *pacca-niyyāhi*, DN II 22,16, *a-paribrūhayi*, Ja V 361,16\* (cf. CPD s.v. <sup>2a</sup>, Rem. a/b), (BHS) *adhy-a-bhāṣati abhy-a-siñcet, upāsaṃkrāmat* (cf. BHS § 32.5, 8, 12), (Skt.) *pary-a-rundhīta*, R 4,1143\* (~ *pratyarautsīt*, 4,1144\*), (imp.) *abhy-a-bhāṣa*, R 4,3.25, (part.) *vy-a-caran*, R 3,37.3/4, *vy-a-dīpayan*, R 2,5.24, *abhy-a-vahan*, R 4,11\*, *a-saṃbhramat*, Mbh 6,78.38, 7,75.5, *praty-a-vyūhan*, Mbh 3,269.6, *praty-a-saṃharam*, R 5,56.55.

A close comparison of these languages sheds light on linguistic phenomena of Middle Indo-Aryan ill-judged in our grammars (cf. 1.2.1.). And it even may help to solve some of the enigmas of Indo-Aryan philology which have long troubled scholars (cf. 1.2.2.). I shall briefly discuss two examples to illustrate these points.

*paśyāma iti rāghavam*, R 2,51.10, *ity uvāca vacaḥ krūram didhakṣann iva tejasā / kiṃ tavāpakṛtaṃ rājan vane nivasatā mayā*, R 2,57.29.

36/7

## 1.2.1. Syncopation

It is only in the “latest additions” of the pW (p. 315 s.v. *astra*) that the two “Petersburger Wörterbücher” give for *iṣvastra-* the meaning “the science of arms” (with reference to Mbh 1,123.13.43)<sup>25</sup>. But also at Mbh 5,178.16 (*iṣvastram mama bālasya bhavataiva caturvidham / upadiṣṭam ...*) and 9,5.14 (*daśāṅgam yaś catuspādām iṣvastram veda tattvataḥ*) this word clearly has this meaning – as it has at Divyāvadāna 528.6. Obviously, Pischel (as also Chatterji 1983: 63) was not aware of this meaning of *iṣvastra-* when he derived the Prakrit word *īsattha-* from Skt. *iṣuśāstra-* (§ 148). In order to overcome the phonetic difficulties he had to postulate the loss of the vowel *-u-*: *īsattha-* ← *\*is[u]sattha-*. According to Pischel, about ten words show this complete loss of a vowel. But, as with *īsattha-*, some of them also have to be explained differently: α) *uppim*<sup>26</sup> ← *upari x uttara[m]*; β) *khu / hu*<sup>27</sup> ← *kho* ← *kha'u*<sup>28</sup>; γ) *majjhaṇṇa*<sup>29</sup> ← (by *dh\_\_h*-dissimilation) *madhyāhna-* (Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 1879-1880; AiGr. I § 108 n.); δ) *sunhā-* / *soṇhā-*<sup>30</sup> ← *\*nhusā-* ← *snuṣā-* (Jacobi 1886: XXXII n. 3). So we are left only with *subbhi-* (← *sur<sub>a</sub>bhi-*) and (the analogically formed) *dubbhi-* and, interestingly enough, with some kinship terms: *dhīyā-* (← nom. sg. *duhitā* [already dissyllabic in late Vedic: Lüders, Phil. Ind. p. 506]), *piusiyā-*, *bhāujjā-*, *māussīā-* (etc.). But we know that kinship terms are, being terms of address, subject to irregular shortening. So there is only one single example for the phenomenon of “vowel loss”. Could *subbhi-*

<sup>25</sup> Neither Monier-Williams nor Apte gives this meaning.

<sup>26</sup> Pischel derived this word from *up<sub>a</sub>ri*.

<sup>27</sup> For the derivation of this word see below.

<sup>28</sup> Such particles often show peculiar phonetics (cf. Jacobi 1886: LXXII).

<sup>29</sup> Pischel derived it from *madhyāṃd na-*.

<sup>30</sup> Pischel derived these words from *sun<sub>a</sub>hā-*, the ‘h-variant’ of *sunusā-* which is a continuation of *snuṣā-*.

and *dubhi-* be words of the women's language and do they as such have a more popular form?

If we take a closer look at the paragraph of Geiger's grammar dealing with vowel syncope (§ 20), some of its examples likewise disappear: *jaggati* is not "to be traced from *jāgarati* through \**jāg<sup>r</sup>ati*", but has developed out of (Epic) Sanskrit (3. sg.) *jāgrati*<sup>31</sup>, based on the present stem *jāgra*<sup>o</sup> which was extracted from (3. pl.) *jāgrati*; *kho* does not result from *khalu* by syncope of *a*, but is due to the loss of the intervocalic *l* and the subsequent contraction of *a-u* to *o* (cf. Pisani 1952: 281); and *mhe* (besides *mahe*) is based on a form \**-āme* (= x : *-āma* = *-ate* : *-ati* = *-ase* : *-asi* = *-ante* : *-anti*) into which the *h* of *-ahve* has been introduced (cf. Berger 1957: 112)<sup>32</sup>.

It is evident that Epic Sanskrit enjoins us to reconsider the whole phenomenon of the *syncope* of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan and to look for the special conditions under which it takes place. Vowels are syncopated, as far as I can see, only in words or word elements that are "phonetically weak" – to borrow Turner's term (Coll. Papers p. 291) – such as (I) second members of compounds, (II) enclitics, (III) suffixes and (IV) terms of address.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 497, Tedesco 1947: 176, Berger 1955: 18 n. 14.

<sup>32</sup> Geiger's second example, *oka-* from *udaka-*, is very problematic (cf. Tedesco 1947: 176), since there is only *one* single place where *oka-* certainly means "water", viz. Vin I 253,14: *okapunnēhi civarehi* "with cloaks filled with water" (not recorded by Geiger). So we have to allow for the possibility that it is a mere blunder of the text – the more so as it is obscure (pace Geiger's explanation) exactly where the *o-* comes from (should we read *+odapunnēhi* with *oda-* wrongly abstracted from compounds like *niloda-*?).

87/7

### 1.2.2. Preterites in °ī(y)a

In a great number of Prakrit texts we come across a petrified preterite form in °īa used for all numbers (in that respect resembling *āsi* [Pischel § 515]): *acchīa*, *āsiya*, *geṇhīa*, *vasīya*<sup>33</sup>. So far no explanation of these °ī(y)a pasts has been given. I think Pischel was on the right track when he supposed that this form must be an optative, "as inexplicable as this seems" (Pischel § 466). Now it is a well known fact that in non-standard Sanskrit an optative can be used in place of a past tense<sup>34</sup>; and we know that optatives were used as preterites in Prakrit, too<sup>35</sup>. As we have °īta-optatives – since late Vedic times even in the thematic conjugation (cf. Hoffmann 1976: 371)<sup>36</sup> – I suggest that the cited Prakrit form is the continuation of an °īta-optative. At the moment I can cite only one, but very instructive example: *pary-a-rundhīta*, R 4,1143\*, which corresponds to *pratyarautsīt*, 4.1144\*! Once this °īa was deemed an ending of the past tense, it was even appended to aorist stems (*kāsiya*, *kahesiya*, *thāsiya*).

### 2. Late Vedic, Epic Sanskrit, Pāṇini and Pali

The relationship of Pali to late Vedic on the one hand and to Pāṇini's Sanskrit (especially to the *bhāṣā* he described) on the other has

<sup>33</sup> These forms are discussed and text references are given by (e.g.) Alsdorf 1935/37: 325 (= Kl. Sch. p. 62), Bhayani / Shah 1987: 44, and Balbir 1989: 510-512 (with literature); cf. Alsdorf 1957: 207 n. 1 (= Kl. Sch. p. 191 n. 1) and Bollée 1995: 144 (s.v. *-īya*).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. BHSG § 32.85-105, Dschi 1949: 250 n. 1, Upadhye 1943: 100, Katre 1937, 1938 and 1939.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Pischel § 466, von Hinüber § 445 and Balbir 1989: 509 with n. 39.

<sup>36</sup> For the Mahābhārata cf. *bhākṣayīta*, Mbh 13,107.82, *vivarjayīta*, Mbh 5,39.35, *prativāsayīta*, Mbh 5,37.31, *yājayīta*, Mbh 3,197.35. Interestingly enough, the Rāmāyaṇa does not seem to know such forms.

never been systematically investigated (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 308-310). But even a cursory reading of the Jātakas brings a number of further parallels to light.

### 2.1. *iva* instead of *eva*

Since late Vedic times *iva* is used "in the sense practically of *eva*" (Keith 1920: 89, cf. id. 1908: 1192-1193): *prṣṭhata ivāgnīdhrām kṛtvā* "placing the Agnīd's altar at his back", AitB 1.30, *yadi ha vā api bahava iva yajante* "even if many sacrifice", AitB 2.2, *so 'je jyoktamām ivāramata* "[The camel] dwelt for the longest time in the goat", AitB 2.8<sup>37</sup>. The same usage is met with in Epic Sanskrit: *tato nātimahān kālaḥ samatīta ivābhavat* "Not too long a time had passed since then", Mbh 1,35.3, *prāñjalim prahvam āsīnam abhivikṣya smayann iva* "smiling as he looked at him ...", R 2,4.42 (at least according to the explanation of Ck)<sup>38</sup>. This probably accounts for the pleonastic collocation *iva ... yathā: vicikṣipur yathā śyenā nabhogatam ivāmiṣam* (سس) "As vultures tear apart a piece of raw meat thrown into the air", Mbh 2,33.6, *adhāryamānā sraj ivottamā yathā* (سس/سس) "Like a beautiful garland that is not being worn", Mbh 4,13.11 (cf. *kiṃ mātur anke śayito yathā śīśuś / candram jighrkṣur iva manyase hi mām*, Mbh 4,13.21). The same phenomenon is met with in Pali (cf. CPD s.v. *iva*). On the other hand, *eva* is sometimes used where we would expect *iva*: *bhasmany eva hutāśanaḥ*, Mbh 4,36.29 v.1. (crit. ed. *bhasmaneva* [cf. PW V,1222 s.v. *eva*]); *alāpūn' eva*, DhP 149, *dhajaggān' eva dissare*, Ja VI 529,33\* = 530,24\*, *rohiṇi h' eva tamb' akkhī*, Ja VI 576,6\* (emended by Alsdorf, Kl. Sch. p. 312 resp. 325, to *dhajaggānīva* resp. *hīva*); *macchā vesāliyā*

<sup>37</sup> Thieme pointed out this function of *iva* which he called "relativierend" (1963: 105 n. 2 [= Kl. Sch. p. 195 n. 2]).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. R 2,12.2, 108.6 (cf. Pollock. The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki. Vol. II. Ayodhyākāṇḍa. Note *ad loc.*) and 3,13.3.

*c' eva udagass' abhiyāgama*, Sūyagaḍaṅga 1.1.3.2 (or does *c' eva* represent *ca + iva*?).

### 2.2. *ca* instead of *ce*

Pāṇini 8.1.30 distinguishes between two words *ca* by adding to one the marker *ṇ*. This *caṇ* is, as is explained by Kātyāyana (*caṇ nidviṣiṣṭas cedathe*), equivalent to *ce* "if": *ayaṃ ca vai marīṣyati* (=) *ayaṃ cen marīṣyati* (Mahābhāṣya III 375,8). The greater "Petersburger Wörterbuch" cites several examples from Vedic literature (cf. Speyer 1896: § 282, Renou 1952: 384) and one from the Mahābhārata<sup>39</sup>: *jīvituṃ cecchase mūḍha hetum me gadataḥ śṛṇu* "If you want to survive ... ", Mbh 3,256.10 (= 4, App.32.13 [v.l. *jīvam icchasi cen mūḍha*]). One more reference can be added: *vakṣyāmi ... manyase ca mām*, Mbh 13,38.5 (v.l. *ce*). This use of *ca* seems to have been obliterated in Classical Sanskrit<sup>40</sup>. But it is quite often to be found in the Jātaka<sup>41</sup>: *ciraṃ pi kho taṃ khādeyya gadrabho haritaṃ yavaṃ / ... ravamāno ca dūsayi* (سس) "The donkey would have eaten ... the barley for a long time if he had not come to harm by his cry", Ja II 110,18\*-19\*, *idaṃ ca tuyhaṃ rucitaṃ / Sutasoma ajj' evā dāni tvaṃ pabbaja* "If this pleases you ... ", Ja V 185,22\*<sup>42</sup>, *sakko ca*<sup>43</sup> *me varaṃ dajjā / so ca labbhetha me varo* "If Sakka should give me a boon my choice would be quickly taken", Ja V

<sup>39</sup> The stanza Bhartṛhari 2.45 cited by PW (*lobhaś cāsti guṇena ...*) is Nītiśataka 37 and runs in Kosambi's edition as follows: *lobhaś ced aguṇena kiṃ piṣunatā yady asti kiṃ pātakaiḥ!*

<sup>40</sup> For details cf. Gonda 1957: 52-54 (= Selected Studies I,371-373).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Gonda 1957: 54 (= Selected Studies I,373). Cf. Sūyagaḍaṅga 1.1.3.9: ... *loyaṃ būyā, kaḍe' tti ya* "If they maintain that ..." (cf. Bollée 1977: 112-113 and 193 s.v. *ya* [with a reference to Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 257-261]).

<sup>42</sup> The first *pāda* is a *bha-vipulā* (cf. Alsdorf 1968: 34) whose third syllable has to be a short one.

<sup>43</sup> Fausbøll's manuscript B<sup>4</sup> reads *ce*.

216,1\*<sup>44</sup>, *sabbañ ca*<sup>45</sup> *maccā sadhanā sabhogā / ādīpitaṃ dāru tiṇena missaṃ* "If people would burn all wood ...", Ja VI 206,9\*, *etañ ca saccam vacanaṃ bhavēyya / ... / nākhattiyo jātu labhetha rajjaṃ* "If this word were true ... no non-kṣatriya would obtain kingship", Ja VI 208,1\*/3\*<sup>46</sup>. The poets obviously use *ca* due to metrical exigencies as a "doublet prosodique" (Smith 1950: 3) of *ce*. And since *ca* is used in the sense of *ce*, *ce*, vice versa, sometimes stands for *ca*: *tathā maṃ saccam pāletu / pālayissati ce mamaṃ* (—!) "Hence truth should protect me — and surely, it will protect me", Ja V 95,1\*<sup>47</sup>, *thale yathā +vāri janinda vaṭṭaṃ / anaddhaneyyaṃ aciraṭṭhitikaṃ / evaṃ pi ce hoti asataṃ samāgamo* "Like water rained down on dry land, not lasting, of no long permanence, so, o king, is the association with bad people", Ja V 508,1\*. Here *ce* is joined to *pr*<sup>48</sup> as often as is *ca*.

### 2.3. *su* as an *upasarga*

Pāṇini teaches in his rules 1.4.58-59 that *pra* etc. are called *upasargas* if they are linked directly to verbs. According to the corresponding *gana* the word *su* belongs to this group. That means that *su* should be used as a verbal prefix! And indeed, we find several examples of this use in Epic Sanskrit: *sv-anuyāsyanti*, Mbh 8,22.59 v.l., *su-upatasthe*, Mbh (cited by Whitney § 1121i without reference), *sukarute*, Mbh 7,163.30 v.l., *sv-ajanayat*, Mbh 3,217.6 v.l. (ed. Bomb., not

<sup>44</sup> This line corresponds to Mvu III 6,15: *śakraś ca* (thus the manuscripts which Senart emended to *ce*) *me varaṃ dadyāt*.

<sup>45</sup> According to Alsdorf (1977: 42) the Sinhalese print (C) reads *ce*. But the third syllable of the *triṣṭubh-pāda* has to be a short one.

<sup>46</sup> If *bhuñjatu* can be used as a conditional the following example may be added: *idañ ca mayhaṃ uttiṭṭhapiṇḍaṃ / +taṃ maṇḍavyo bhuñjatu appapañño / yakkhā ca te naṃ na viheṭṭhayeyyūṃ / putto ca te hohiti so arogo*, Ja IV 386,12\*-15\*.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Lüders, Märchen 253.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. *pubbe va dānā sumanā bhavāma / dadaṃ pi ce* (B<sup>d</sup> *ca*) *attamanā bhavāma*, Ja IV 53,15\* (cf. Kern, Toev. I/108).

89/7

noted by CE [cf. PW s.v. 6. su]), *su-dhāsyati*, Mbh 1,114.31, *su-rocaya*, Mbh 4,1.8 v.l., *su-virājate*, Mbh 4,60.4 v.l., *su-śakyante*, R 2,30.4 v.l. The same holds true for Pali: *kiṃ sū-vadhivā na kadāci socati*, Ja V 141,10\*, corresponding to Mvu III 370,1\* *kiṃ so-vadhivā na kadāci socati* (cf. Smith 1950: 13)<sup>49</sup>, *(mā) su-nandi ... mā su-soci*, Ja I 300,20\* (*sukāro nipātamattam*, ct.), *su-māpaya*, Cariyāp. 9.107, *su-māpayi*, Cariyāp. 9.108, Mahāvamsa, App. A stanza 3 (ed. Geiger p. 326 n. 3), *su-bodduṃ* Kaccāyanappakarāṇa 200 (ed. Senart [cf. Childers s.v. su at the end]), cf. (with a participle:) *su-codiyantaṃ*, Ja VI 249,1\* (*sutthu codiyantaṃ*, ct.)<sup>50</sup>.

### 3. Vocabulary

But Pali and Epic Sanskrit can not only be adduced to confirm Pāṇini's rules as far as syntactical features are concerned, but also to confirm his teaching on how to form words with particular meanings. On the other hand, taking into account Pāṇini and late Vedic texts enables a number of Pali words of obscure meaning to be explained. First an example of the latter kind:

#### 3.1. *udaṅgaṇa*- (Ja I 109,15\*)

For this word the PED gives the meaning "an open space" — whereas the CPD gives no meaning at all — relying on the explanation of the commentary: *udaṅgaṇe ti ettha uda itī nipāto, aṅgaṇe ti attho, manussānaṃ saṃcaranaṭṭhāne anāvaṭṭe bhūmibhāge ti attho* (I 109,20'-21'). This is, of course, impossible, so another explanation is called for. We have in Pali *uluṅka-* / *uḷuṅka-* "ladle, spoon (for fetching water)"

<sup>49</sup> It cannot be ruled out that we have to do with *so* for *sū*, the regular outcome of *svīd* (cf. Edgerton s.v. so).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Aḷāra etā su te +kāmākārā*, Ja V 170,29\*.

(cf. Ja I 120,23, 423,14) which corresponds to Skt. *udaṅka-* (Mānavaśrautasūtra 1.1.2, Pāṇ 3.3.123)<sup>51</sup>. This word is derived from *ud-√a(ṛi)c*; this root denotes, as we know from Vedic texts (cf. Hoffmann 1975: 162-165), the action of drawing water (cf. *udañcanī*, Ja I 417,10\* [*udakaṃ añcanti etāya*, ct.]). It seems – despite all phonetic difficulties – that *udaṅga-* belongs to this very root: *akilāsuno vaṇṇupathe khaṇantā / udaṅgaṇe tattha papāṃ avindum* “untiringly digging in the desert<sup>52</sup> they found there a watering place<sup>53</sup> for drawing up [the bucket]” (Ja I 109,15\*). The fondness of the poet of the stanza under discussion for “dark” words (*papā-*, *akilāsu-*, *vaṇṇu[patha]-*)<sup>54</sup> may account for this quite unusual sound change. We meet with a similar case of a transition of a (voiced) palatal into a guttural, and of a dental nasal into a cerebral, in certain derivations from *√aṅj* both in Pali (*[an- / nir- / s'-Jaṅgaṇa-* “dirt”) and in Pkr. (*abbhaṅgaṇa-*, *niraṅgaṇa-* [Pischel § 234]).

### 3.2. *koleyyaka-* (Ja I 177,2\*)

Pāṇini teaches in rule 4.2.96 (*kula-kukṣi-grīvābhyah śvāsy-alamkāreṣu*; cf. 4.1.140) that the suffix *eyaka-* is added to the word *kula-* to denote a “dog of good breed”. Our dictionaries show that the word *kauleyaka-* is found as late as the Kādambarī and Harṣacarita. Some

<sup>51</sup> This word should be added to the examples given by Oberlies 1995a: 191 of the dissimilation of *-d-* to *-l-* before a following nasal.

<sup>52</sup> For this meaning of *vaṇṇapatha-*, which is borne out by the prose-tale (cf. Ja I 107,23), cf. Lévi 1925: 47.

<sup>53</sup> We learn from Kātyāyana's *vārttika* 4 ad Pāṇ 3.3.58 that the word *prapā-* denotes a “place for supplying water” (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 309). In the Jātaka the word is attested one more time: *yathā nadī ca pantho ca pānāgāraṃ sabhā papā / evaṃ lokitthiyo nāma nāsaṃ kujjhanti paṇḍitā*, Ja I 302,3\* (for further references cf. PED s.v.; cf. Sadd p. 622 n. 18).

<sup>54</sup> Also the employment of the locative to denote purpose seems to be rather idiosyncratic.

9/7

centuries earlier it is found in the Jātaka: Ja I 177,2\*, II 348,21(\*) v.l. (B<sup>d</sup>), IV 437,18.

### 3.3. *gīveyya-* (Ja IV 395,17\*, VI 590,9\*)

According to the same rule of Pāṇini (4.2.96), the word *graiveyaka-* is formed to denote a piece of jewellery. Compared with the rather late attested Sanskrit word (Devīmāhātmya, Daśakumāracarita, Sāhityadarpana) the Pali word *gīveyya-* occurs in old texts (Ja IV 395,17\*, VI 590,9\*; *eyyaka-*, V 297,14 [for further references cf. PED s.v. *gīveyyaka*]).

Freiburg i. Br.

Thomas Oberlies

## Literature

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Alsdorf 1928    | L. Alsdorf. Der Kumārapālapratibodha. Hamburg 1928 (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 2).   |
| Alsdorf 1935/37 | Id. The Vasudevahiṇḍī, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī. BSOS 8 (1935/37) 319-333 (= Kl. Sch. p. 56-70).                        |
| Alsdorf 1957    | Id. The story of Citta and Sambhūta. Felicitation Volume presented to S. K. Belvalkar. Benares 1957, 202-208 (= Kl. Sch. p. 186-192). |
| Alsdorf 1968    | Id. Die Āryā-Strophen des Pali-Kanons. Wiesbaden 1968 (AWLM 1967.4).  |
| Alsdorf 1977    | Id. Das Bhūridatta-Jātaka. WZKS 21 (1977) 25-55.  |

- Balbir 1989 N. Balbir. Morphological Evidence for Dialectal Variety in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. In: Dialectes dans les littératures Indo-Aryennes (ed. by C. Caillat). Paris 1989, 503-525.
- Bechert 1955 H. Bechert. Vokalkürzung vor Sandhikonsonant. MSS 6 (1955) 7-26.
- Bechert 1958 Id. Grammatisches aus dem Apadānabuch. ZDMG 108 (1958) 308-316.
- Berger 1955 H. Berger. Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre. München 1955.
- Berger 1957 Id. Bemerkungen zur Endung der 1. pl. präs. in Mittelindischen. MSS 11 (1957) 109-112.
- Bhayani 1953 H. C. Bhayani. Paumacariu of Kavirāja Svayambhūdeva. Part First. Bombay 1953.
- Bhayani / Shah 1987 H. C. Bhayani / R. M. Shah. Vasudevahiṇḍi Madhyama Khaṇḍa. Part I. Ahmedabad 1987.
- Bollée 1977 W. B. Bollée. Studien zum Sūyagaḍa. Wiesbaden 1977.
- Bollée 1995 W. B. Bollée. The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta: Āyāraṅga, Dasaveyāliya, Uttarajjhāyā and Sūyagaḍa. Stuttgart 1995.
- Chatterji 1983 S. K. Chatterji. On the Development of Middle Indo-Aryan. Calcutta 1983.
- Dschi 1949 Hiän-li Dschi. Die Verwendung des Aorists als Kriterium für Alter und Ursprung buddhistischer Texte. NAWG 1949, 245-301.

- Ghatage 1937 A. M. Ghatage. Instrumental and Locative in Ardha-Māgadhī. IHQ 13 (1937) 52-58.
- Ghatage 1941 Id. Introduction to Ardha-Māgadhī. Kolhapur 1941.
- Ghatage 1953 Id. A Locative Form in Paumacariya. Summaries of the All-India Oriental Conference 16 (1953) 116-117.
- Gonda 1957 J. Gonda. The Use of the Particle *ca*. Vāk 5 (1957) 1-73 (= Selected Studies I,320-392).
- von Hinüber 1968 O. von Hinüber. Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka. München 1968.
- von Hinüber 1983 Review of H. Bechert (ed.), Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. Göttingen 1980. IF 88 (1983) 307-312.
- von Hinüber 1986 Id. Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. Wien 1986 (cited as von Hinüber).
- Hoffmann 1975 K. Hoffmann. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 1. Wiesbaden 1975.
- Hoffmann 1976 Id. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 2. Wiesbaden 1976.
- Hopkins 1903 E. W. Hopkins. Limitation of time by means of cases in Epic Sanskrit. AJP 24 (1903) 1-24.
- Insler 1994 St. Insler. Rhythmic Effects in Pali Morphology. Die Sprache 36 (1994) 70-93.
- Jacobi 1886 H. Jacobi. Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī. Leipzig 1886.
- Jacobi 1918 Id. Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhaṇavāla. München 1918.

92/7

- 24 Thomas Oberlies
- Katre 1937 S. M. Katre. Epic *iyāt* and Blends of Aorist and Optative Forms. JAOS 57 (1937) 316-317.
- Katre 1938 Id. Epic *iyāt*. NIA 1 (1938) 536.
- Katre 1939 Id. Apropos Epic *iyāt*. BDCRI 1 (1939) 8-13.
- Keith 1908 B. Keith. Review of J. Hertel. Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hemacandra's *Parīśiṣṭaparvan* (Leipzig 1908). JRAS 1908, 1191-1193.
- Keith 1920 Id. Rigveda Brāhmaṇas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda. London 1920 (Delhi 1981<sup>3</sup>).
- Kielhorn 1898 F. Kielhorn. The Jātakas and Sanskrit Grammarians. JRAS 1898, 17-21 (= Kl. Sch. p. 294-298).
- Kulkarni 1946 E. D. Kulkarni. Epic Variants. Case Variation in the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. BDCRI 7 (1946) 1-219.
- Lévi 1925 S. Lévi. Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Brhatkathā. PEFEO 22 (1925) 1-55.
- Lüders 1954 H. Lüders. Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons. Berlin 1954.
- Meenakshi 1983 K. Meenakshi. Epic Syntax. New Delhi 1983.
- Oberlies 1995 Th. Oberlies. Beiträge zur Pali-Lexikographie. IJ 38 (1995) 105-147.
- Oberlies 1995a Id. Die Wurzel *gad* im Mittelindischen. HS 108 (1995) 190-191.
- Oberlies 1996 Id. Stray remarks on Pali phonology, morphology, and vocabulary (Some addenda to Geiger's Pali grammar). MSS 1996 (forthcoming).

- Pali, Pāṇini and "popular" Sanskrit 25
- Pathak 1969 R. A. Pathak. Some linguistic peculiarities in the Purāṇas. Purāṇa 11 (1969) 119-126.
- Pisani 1934 V. Pisani. Glosse marginali al *Mahābhārata*. Rivista degli Studi Orientali 15 (1934) 65-75.
- Pisani 1946 Id. On some peculiarities of the use of cases in the Ādiparvan. NIA 8 (1946) 187-190.
- Pisani 1952 Id. Noterelle Pāli. Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo dei scienze e lettere (Classe di lettere). 85 (1952) 279-288.
- Renou 1952 L. Renou. Grammaire de la langue védique. Lyon 1952.
- Sen 1958 S. Sen. History and pre-history of Sanskrit. Mysore 1958.
- Singh 1980 R. A. Singh. Syntax of Apabhraṃśa. Calcutta 1980.
- Smith 1950 H. Smith. Les deux prosodies du vers Bouddhique. Human. Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1949-1950, I.
- Smith 1954 Id. Analecta rhythmica. Studia Orientalia (editit Societas Orientalis Fennica) XIX: 7 (1954) 3-17.
- Speijer 1886 J. S. Speijer. Sanskrit Syntax. Leiden 1886 (reprinted Delhi 1993).
- Speijer 1896 Id. Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax. Strassburg 1896 (Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I, 6).
- Tedesco 1947 P. Tedesco. Sanskrit *pudgala* "body; soul". JAOS 67 (1947) 172-177.



93/7

26

Thomas Oberlies

- Thieme 1963 P. Thieme. *āścarya*. ZvS 78 (1963) 104-111 (= Kl. Sch. p. 194-201).
- Upadhye 1943 A. N. Upadhye. *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Āchārya Hariṣeṇa. Bombay 1943.
- Upadhye 1944 Id. The Dhūrtākhyāna: A Critical Study. In: Śri Jina Vijaya Muni. Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra Sūri. Bombay 1944, 1-56.
- Upadhye 1974 Id. Prabhācandra's Ārādhana-Kathā-Prabandha or Kathākośa. New Delhi 1974 (Mānikachandra D. Jaina Granthamālā No. 55).
- de Vreese 1955 K. de Vreese. Did Middle Indian know an abl. sg. m. n. in *-am*? BSOAS 17 (1955) 369-371.
- de Vreese 1953 Id. Dravidismen in het latere Pali. Handelingen van het Twintigste Vlaams Filologencongres. Antwerpen 1953, 96-99.
- de Vreese 1980 Id. Dravidian Idioms in Later Pali. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 11 (1980) 179-222.
- de Wijesekera 1993 O. H. de A. Wijesekera. Syntax of the Cases in the Pāli Nikāyas. Colombo 1993 (Thesis, University of London, 1936).

## The \*Paramatthajotikādīpanī, a Fragment of the Subcommentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta\*

Subcommentaries on texts of the Khuddakanikāya are known to have existed so far only from the evidence found in the Piṭakat samuini'. Consequently, it came as a pleasant surprise, when a fragmentary manuscript copied as early as in CS 894 corresponding to 1532 A.D. came to light in the collection of Vat Lai Hin near Lampang in Northern Thailand<sup>2</sup>. The text of this fragment covers Pj II 513,16 on Sn 770 in the Kāmasutta of the Mahāvagga up to Pj II 548,29 on Sn 848, the first verse of the Purābhedasutta of the Aṭṭhakavagga.

The cover leaves at the beginning and at the end of the single fascicle extant communicate only the title given erroneously as *tikā* (sic!) *suttanipāta aṅguttara* (!)<sup>3</sup> and the year without containing a complete colophon. Therefore the real title of this subcommentary can be inferred only from the titles given at the end of the single Suttas of the Suttanipāta such as Kāmasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī. Thus "Paramatthajotikādīpanī" is nothing more than a likely guess<sup>4</sup>.

\* The abbreviations used follow the system laid down in the Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

<sup>1</sup> On the Piṭ-sm cf. O.v.Hinüber: A Handbook of Pāli Literature. Berlin 1996 § 4. - The only exception is the Linatthappakāsini on the Jātaka, cf. *ibidem* § 261 and 359.

<sup>2</sup> This collection will be described in: O.v.Hinüber: Die Pāli-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand (under preparation), where this manuscript is listed as no. 63, see also JPTS 22.1996, p. 35-37.

<sup>3</sup> In spite of the fact that *su-* is clearly written, the scribe seems to have thought of the Sattakanipāta in the Aṅguttaranikāya.

<sup>4</sup> It is not impossible that the correct title is Paramatthasūdanī rather, if Nāṇamoli: The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning (Paramatthajotikā) Part I. London 1960, p. V is correct in taking Ādiccavaṃsa's Paramatthasūdanī mentioned in Piṭ-sm to cover also Pj II, but cf. CPD (Epilegomena) 2.5.1,12 and 2.5.5,12.

- Thieme 1963 P. Thieme. *āścarya-*. ZvS 78 (1963) 104-111 (= Kl. Sch. p. 194-201).
- Upadhye 1943 A. N. Upadhye. *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Āchārya Hariṣena. Bombay 1943.
- Upadhye 1944 Id. *The Dhūrtākhyāna: A Critical Study*. In: Śrī Jina Vijaya Muni. *Dhūrtākhyāna* of Haribhadra Sūri. Bombay 1944, 1-56.
- Upadhye 1974 Id. *Prabhācandra's Ārādhana-Kathā-Prabandha* or *Kathākośa*. New Delhi 1974 (Māṇikachandra D. Jaina Granthamālā No. 55).
- de Vreese 1955 K. de Vreese. Did Middle Indian know an abl. sg. m n. in *-am*? BSOAS 17 (1955) 369-371.
- de Vreese 1953 Id. *Dravidismen in het latere Pali*. Handelingen van het Twintigste Vlaams Filologencongres. Antwerpen 1953, 96-99.
- de Vreese 1980 Id. *Dravidian Idioms in Later Pali*. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 11 (1980) 179-222.
- de Wijsekera 1993 O. H. de A. Wijsekera. *Syntax of the Cases in the Pāli Nikāyas*. Colombo 1993 (Thesis, University of London, 1936).

## The \*Paramatthajotikādīpanī, a Fragment of the Subcommentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta\*

Subcommentaries on texts of the Khuddakanikāya are known to have existed so far only from the evidence found in the Piṭakat samuīn<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, it came as a pleasant surprise, when a fragmentary manuscript copied as early as in CS 894 corresponding to 1532 A.D. came to light in the collection of Vat Lai Hin near Lampang in Northern Thailand<sup>2</sup>. The text of this fragment covers Pj II 513,16 on Sn 770 in the Kāmasutta of the Mahāvagga up to Pj II 548,29 on Sn 848, the first verse of the Purābhedasutta of the Aṭṭhakavagga.

The cover leaves at the beginning and at the end of the single fascicle extant communicate only the title given erroneously as *nikā* (sic!) *suttanipāta aṅguttara* (!)<sup>3</sup> and the year without containing a complete colophon. Therefore the real title of this subcommentary can be inferred only from the titles given at the end of the single Suttas of the Suttanipāta such as *Kāmasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī*. Thus "Paramatthajotikādīpanī" is nothing more than a likely guess<sup>4</sup>.

\* The abbreviations used follow the system laid down in the Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

<sup>1</sup> On the Piṭ-sm cf. O.v.Hinüber: *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin 1996 § 4. - The only exception is the Linatthappakāsini on the Jātaka, cf. *ibidem* § 261 and 359.

<sup>2</sup> This collection will be described in: O.v.Hinüber: *Die Pāli-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand* (under preparation), where this manuscript is listed as no. 63, see also JPTS 22.1996, p. 35-37.

<sup>3</sup> In spite of the fact that *su-* is clearly written, the scribe seems to have thought of the Sattakanipāta in the Aṅguttaranikāya.

<sup>4</sup> It is not impossible that the correct title is *Paramatthasūdanī* rather, if Nāṇamoli: *The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning (Paramatthajotikā)* Part I. London 1960, p. V is correct in taking Ādiccavaṇṇa's *Paramatthasūdanī* mentioned in Piṭ-sm to cover also Pj II, but cf. CPD (Epilegomena) 2.5.1,12 and 2.5.5,12.

The manuscript itself also contains quite a few mistakes, partly corrected by the scribe himself. These corrections have not been marked in the following transcript in detail. Obvious additions or omissions, however, have been indicated by square brackets: ["wrong addition by the scribe"] and pointed brackets: <"omission by the scribe"> respectively. Variants found in the *pratīkas* are mentioned after the quotations from Pj II or Sn. The vowels *i/i* are often confused by the scribe as usual in the South East Asian Pāli tradition. This has not been normalized.

The text published here is the first half of fascicule no. 6 containing the folios marked as *ta-tah*. This corresponds to about 35 pages of the printed edition of Pj II. Consequently, the preceding five fascicles should have contained the text corresponding to approximately only 350 pages instead of 512. The gap of about 160 pages missing cannot be explained, if the relation between this subcommentary and Pj II is the same all over the text as it is in the present fragment. Even if it varies, the missing text of almost 2½ fascicles is much longer than to be expected.

The anonymous author of the subcommentary used not only Pj II (his basic text), but also Nidd I, which he refers to occasionally. Besides, a remarkable number of technical terms occurs even within in this brief fragment: *atthuppatti-sankhāta-samuṭṭhāna* (Sn 772: 514,5-515,29<sup>5</sup>; cf. on this technical use of *samuṭṭhāna*: Pj I 118,2 : Pj II 300,2 and *suttavathubhūtaassa atthassa uppattikāle*, 521,5); *avuttasampiṇḍattha* (533,2 "enumeration, which is not quoted in full"); *ekasesarūpanayena* (536,7, cf. Sadd 6.2.3, CPD s.v. *ekaseṣa*, and L.Renou, Terminologie grammaticale. Paris 1957, p. 115 s.v. *ekaseṣa*); *tatvakathā* (514,3, meaning uncertain); *nipātamattam* (516,11; Sn 827b);

<sup>5</sup> These numbers refer to the part of Pj II commented upon.

95/7

*desanānusandhi* (513,32); *pana-saddo pakkhantaratto* (522,21); *pariyāyākathā* (514,3, cf. Sadd 6.1.2.1); *pāṭha* (516,19 etc.); *piṇḍattha* (514,3, cf. Sadd 6.2.1); *pucchānusandhi* (537,27); *purisavippalāsa* (545,23, cf. Sadd 2.3.3); *yathānusandhi* (514,3, cf. Sadd 5.3.2.1; Ja VI 477,21); *yojanā* (520,24 etc., cf. Sadd 6.2.1); *sambandha* (522,25 etc.).

Furthermore, the following cases and their respective functions are mentioned: acc.: *kammatthe upayogavacanam* (516,12); abl.: *nissakke yeva nissakkaṃ* (517,11); gen.: *niddhāraṇe chaṭṭhi* (522,29); loc.: *niddhāraṇe bhummaṃ* (541,10); *nimittatthe bhummaṃ* (541,13); *bhāvalakkhaṇe bhummaṃ hetumhi vā* (541,17; 548,14, cf. Sadd 5.1.0); *sāmiatthe bhummaṃ* (521,27).

At the beginning of the subcommentary on the Purābheda-sutta (Pj II 548,14), a series of six *suttas* is mentioned, which are grouped together already in Pj II 548, 12-14. The Sammāparibbājanīyasutta is indeed characterized in Pj II as: ... *rāgacaritavasena ... devatāgaṇānam ... pannarasa gāthāyo abhāsi*, Pj II 362,11-15. The other characteristics, however, such as *mohacarita* etc. do not seem to be mentioned in the relevant paragraphs of Pj II introducing the *suttas* of this group.

ttham saccavacanam. tenāha abalattā (E° abalā va) baliyantī (Sn 770) ti attho (Pj II 513,16) ti. pākāṭaparisayā (Pj II 513,18 °ssayā) ti cakkhūnam āpātham āgatāvasena parisahanādi-atthena pākāṭaparisayā. niṭṭhāpesī (Pj II 513, 32) ti desanānusandhinā niṭṭhāpesi kāmasuttavaṇṇanā (Pj II 514,3) ti ayam yathānusandhivasena piṇḍatthavasena ca, vaṇṇanāvithāreṇa pana Kāmasuttassa (Sn 776-771) vaṇṇanā Niddese (Nidd I 1,6-22,7) tatvakathāya (?) pariyāyakathāya ca vasena vaṇṇitā va. samattā (cf. niṭṭhitā, Pj II 514,3) ti pariniṭṭhitā, saṃgahetvā vā atthā vuttā ti attho.

*Kāmasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī*, samattā (Pj II 514,3)

96/2

abahulakatā (Pj II 514,26 abahukatā) ti anādaraṃ katvā. ruddho<sup>6</sup> (Pj II 514,26 ruṭṭho) ti ativiya kuddho. aññātukāmo (Pj II 515,5) ti jānitukāmo. taṃ anukampamāno (Pj II 515, 10) ti tasmi karuṇaṃ kurumāno. āsādetuṃ (Pj II 515, 14) ti ghaṭetuṃ. satto guhāyan (Sn 772) ti guhaṭṭhakasuttaṃ. pa. idaṃ suttaṃ abhāsī (Pj II 514,5-515,29) ti idaṃ atthuppattisaṅkhātasamuttānaṃ. rāgādīnaṃ vālānaṃ vasanokasato (Pj II 515,30f.) ti rāgadosamohādīnaṃ atīnaṃ (?)<sup>7</sup> russatṭhena vāli(!)migasadisānaṃ visayavasena āraṇakaraṇavasena<sup>8</sup> vasaṇatṭhānabhāvato. ajhattabandhanan<sup>9</sup> (Pj II 515,32) ti kāyasāṅkhātaṃ ajhatikaṃ bandhanaṭṭhānaṃ. bahiddhābandhanan (Pj II 516,1) ti rūpādīkāmagaṇasaṅkhātaṃ bahiddhābandhanaṭṭhānaṃ. vivekā (Pj II 516,3) ti vivekato. tathārūpo (Pj II 516,2) ti sato (!) guhāyan (Sn 772) ti ādippakāro. vivekā hi (Sn 772c = Pj II 516,1) ti ettha hī ti nipātamattaṃ. sattadhammatan (Pj II 516,7 sattānaṃ dhammataṃ) ti sattānaṃ pakatibhāvaṃ. sukhavedanādīmhi (Pj II 516,9) ti etthaṃ ādisaddena iṭṭhavatthuyobbañña-ārogyajīvitādayo saṃgaṇhāti. bhavasāte (Pj II 516,9f.) ti ettha bhavesu sātasukhavedanādissa rammanikaṃ. bandhā (Pj II 516,10 baddhā) ti laggito (!). bhavasātavatthubhūtā dhammā (Pj II 516,10f.) ti bhavesu sukhas' ādivatthubhūtā dhammā vatthusampadādayo. tatthā (Pj II 516,11) ti bhavasātavatthubhūtesu dhammesu. duppamocayā (Pj II 516,11f.) ti dukkhena pamocetabbā. aññā<sup>10</sup> cā (Pj II 516,12 aññe ca) ti kammaṭṭhe upayogavacanaṃ. yadi pana muñceyyuṃ (Pj II 516,14 muñceyyuṃ) ti sac' eva sabbasattā vaṭṭadukkhato muñceyyuṃ. bandhiyamānā (Pj II 516,19 patthayamānā) ti patthayamānā so yeva vā paṭho. dvinnaṃ padānan (Pj II 516,19) ti apekkhamānapadapa(!)-

<sup>6</sup> I.e. ruddo ?

<sup>7</sup> Read ativiya ?

<sup>8</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. araṇa ?

<sup>9</sup> The scribe uses regularly *-jha-* for *-jjha-*. This is a feature quite common in Northern Thai Pāli manuscripts.

<sup>10</sup> Sic: *-ā* cancelled, no *-e* written.

jappapadānaṃ<sup>11</sup>. apekkhamāna (Pj II 516,21) ti icchamānā. itarathā (Pj II 516,21) ti sambandhato aññena asambandhākarena atthe gaṇhamāne sati. pariyesanā-ti-<ā>din ti (Pj II 516,27 pariyesanādīn) ti ettha ādisaddena rakkhanāsayo saṃgaṇhāti. avaṅgamanatāyā (Pj II 516,28) ti nirayapettivisayatiracchānāyonisaṅkhātālāmakaṭṭhānagamana-tāyā. macchariyatāyā (Pj II 516,29 maccharitāyā) ti macchariya-dhammasamannāgatāyā. antakāle (Pj II 516,30) ti maraṇakāle. maraṇadukkh<u>panitā (Pj II 516,30f.) ti maraṇaṃ dukkhaṃ pattattā. tisu bhajavissāmā (Pj II 516,31 kiṃ su bhavissāma) ti nerayikāyā pettivisayatiracchānāyonisaṅkhātā bhavissāmā ti ādinā vitthārattho veditabbo. ettad evā (Pj II 516,32) ti kāmāgiddhasattassa etaṃ dukkhasambhavanaṃ hoti kāmesu do<sa>sambhavaṃ vā. āpajjeyyā (Pj II 516,33) ti padhānavasena vuttaṃ jāneyyā ti ādi attho sambhavati. na tassa hetū (Sn 775c) ti pāṇātipātādivisamassa hetu. visamaṃ na careyyā (Sn 775c om. na) ti pubbhāgabhūtaṃ lobhadosaḍḍihetuvisamaṃ na careyya. appan tiṭṭhi<sup>12</sup> (Sn 775d) ti parittattāyā sarasaparittatāyā parittaṃ. ye na karontī (Pj II 517,3 ye tathā na karontī) ti ye bhagavato vacanaṃ na karontī. ito c' ito cā (Pj II 517,6) ti taṇhādīhi diṭṭhi byasaṇapariyosānehi. hīnakammantā(!)n (Pj II 517,9 °kammantā) ti kāyakammādiṭṭhapaṅkammavantā. kāmabhavādīkā (Pj II 517,11 kāmabhavādisu) ti nissakke yeva nissakkaṃ. okāraṇ (Pj II 517,22) ti lāmaṇaṃ. yaṃ attānaṃ garaḥi (Pj II 517,31 attanā garaḥati) ti yena kattatā-akattatāsaṅkhātēna kāraṇena hetubhūtena attanā va sattānaṃ garaḥi nindī. dvinnaṃ lepānaṃ (Pj II 517,33) ti taṇhādīdiṭṭhilepānaṃ. pubbhāge (Pj II 518,7) ti lokuttara-ṭṭhappetiṭṭhā<sup>13</sup> pubbhāge.

*Guhaṭṭhakasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī* samattā. (Pj II 518,15)

<sup>11</sup> Pj II 516,21: *jappaṃ*.

<sup>12</sup> Read *appañ hi taṃ* as Sn.

<sup>13</sup> The reading is quite clear in the manuscript: °*dhamme* (?) *thito* (??).

na upeti (Sn 780c = Pj II 520,2) ti kodhadosavasena na upeti na upavadati. natthi rāgādikhilam etassā ti natthi khilo (Sn 780d = Pj II 520,2). kuhifici (Sn 780d = Pj II 520,3) ti ajhattabāhiddhādike kasmi thāne. sabbato (Pj II 520,15) ti sabbatthānesu. yāyaṃ diṭṭhi (Pj II 520,22) ti lobhappadhāna-akusalacittupādasasāṅkhātā diṭṭhi. so (Pj II 520,24) ti titthiyajano. yo vā yassa sassatādivādo (Pj II 520,27 yo vā sassatādivā<sup>14</sup>) ti yassa titthiyajanassa sassato loko ti ādi diṭṭhivādo. so (Pj II 520,24) titthiyajano ti diṭṭhivādam *accayeyyā* (Sn 781a) ti yojanā. tena diṭṭhichandenā (Pj II 520,28) ti tena diṭṭhisasāṅkhātena chandena. anunīto (Sn 801b = Pj II 520,28) ti anu punappunaṃ nīto. nivīṭṭho (Sn 781b = Pj II 520,29) ti paṭiṭṭhito. yathā jāneyyā (Sn 781d = Pj II 520,31) ti sassato loko ti ādinā nayena diṭṭhivādena jāneyya. tassā (Pj II 521,5) ti sutassa. atthuppattiyā (Pj II 521,5) ti suttavattubhūṭassa atthassa uppattikāle. anariyadhammo eso (Pj II 521,11) ti anariyānaṃ puggalānaṃ sabhāvo ayaṃ vādo. iti sīlesū (Pj II 521,14) ti evaṃ silesu. tassa tan (Pj II 521,16) ti puggalassa. taṃ akatthanaṃ (Pj II 521,16) avikatthanaṃ. eso (Pj II 521,17) ti eso akatthanasabhāvatho. rāgādayo satta ussādā (Pj II 521,19) ti rāgadosamohānaṃ diṭṭhikilesassa kammassa duccarit>asaṅkhātā<sup>15</sup> satta ussādā. purato katā (Pj II 521,26) ti padhānabhāvato katā. attanī (Sn 784c = Pj II 521,27) ti ettha attasaddhe diṭṭhivācako sāmīatthe ca bhumman ti āha *attani tassādiyā* (Pj II 521,30) ti. yan (Pj II 521,27 = Sn 784c: yad) ti padassa yasmā yaṃ phalan ti dvidhā attho yujjati. tañ cā (Pj II 522,2) ti tassā micchādiṭṭhiyā ānisaṅsaṅ ca. kuppātāyā (Pj II 522,2) ti bhaṅgavasena ku[ma]ppasabhāvāya. paṭiccasamuppannatāya ca (Pj II 522,3) ti attano paccayehi paṭiccasamuppannā sabhāvāya. samutisantitāyā (Pj II 522,3 sammū° °tatāya) ti diṭṭhigatikānaṃ vohāravasena santisabhāvāya ca. *Mahānidde* saṭṭhakathāyaṃ pana (Nidd-a I 201,26-29): “tasmā tañ ca ānisaṅsaṃ tañ ca kuppātāya ca samutisantikāya ca kuppapaṭicca-santisasāṅkhātaṃ diṭṭhiṃ

<sup>14</sup> N.b. v.l. in E<sup>1</sup>!

<sup>15</sup> Ms. *dasasāṅkhātā*, cf. Pj II 425,29.

97/7

ca nissito hoti” ti pāṭho dissati<sup>16</sup>. *evaṃ nissitena cā* (Pj II 522,6) ti diṭṭhi ca diṭṭhānisaṃ[da]saṅ ca nissitena puggalena. imassa ca sukhena *ativattitabbā* (Pj II 522,9) ti iminā sambandho. *idam-saccābhinivesasasāṅkhātānī* (Pj II 522,8) ti dvāsaṭṭhiditṭhidhammesu yā kāci attanā abhirucitā idam saccam moghamajhan ti abhinivesasasāṅkhātā diṭṭhi. *diṭṭhinivesanānī* (Pj II 522,8<sup>17</sup>) ti ettha nivisanti etthā ti diṭṭhinivesanānī. diṭṭhiyo evaṃ nivesanānī diṭṭhinivesanānī. *pavattā* (Pj II 522,12 pavattattā) ti puggalena pavattāpitā. tesu yeva diṭṭhinivesanesu gahanarocanādivasena pavattaṃ vijjamaṇaṃ sathhāraṇ ca dhammaṇ ca nidassati ca ādiyati cā ti yojanā. ajānaṃ silaṃ pakati ekassā ti *ajānasīlo* (Pj II 522,15) satta<sup>18</sup> sesapadesu es’ eva nayo. *dhamma-kkhānāgaṇādibhedanī*<sup>19</sup> cā (Pj II 522,17) ti ettha ādisaddena diṭṭhipadāmagge saṃgaṇhāti. *yo panā* (Pj II 522,21) ti ettha panasaddo pakkhantaratho. *dhonadhammasammānāgamā* (Pj II 522,24) ti dosadhunanapaññāya samannāgatattā. tassā diṭṭhiyā *abhāvā* (Pj II 522,25 abhāvena) ti tassa vuttapakārāya diṭṭhiya abhāvena hetubhūtena. imassa ca *pahāyā* (Sn 786c) ti iminā sambandho. *titthiyā* (Pj II 522,27) aññadiṭṭhigatikā ti. *yāya* (Pj II 522,28) māyāya katapāpapaṭiccādanāya yena *mānena vā attanā katapāpakammaṃ paṭicchādento* (Pj II 522,28) micchādiṭṭhisasāṅkhātaṃ agantabbaṃ *agatiṃ gacchanti* (Pj II 522,28) pāpuṇanti ti yojanā. *rāgādidosāna* (Pj II 522,29) ti niddhāraṇe chaṭṭhi. *kenā* (Sn 782b = Pj II 522,29) ti kena dosena. tesu tesu dhammesu (Pj II 523,4) ti rāgādisu dhammesu hetubhūtesu.

*Duṭṭhakaṭṭhasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī* samattā. (Pj II 523,16)

<sup>16</sup> The omission of *paṭiccasamuppannatāya* is confirmed neither by E<sup>1</sup> nor by B<sup>1</sup>; both have the same texts as Pj II E<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> Ms. °*vesantānī*.

<sup>18</sup> Ms. *sattha*.

<sup>19</sup> Ms. °*tanhā*° corr. to °*gaṇā*°.

tassā (Pj II 526,9) ti suttassa. **adhigamā** (Pj II 526,12 avigamā) ti yāti uppa(!)kkamati hetutāya dāssanassa. **tenāhā** (Pj II 526,19) ti tasmā taṃ maggaññānaṃ na hoti tasmā bhagavatā *ditṭhena ce suddhī* (Sn 789a) ti dutiyagāthaṃ āhā ti sambandho. **āpannan** (Pj II 526,24) ti dosāpanthānaṃ hoti. **tathā vadānan** (Sn 789d = Pj II 526,25) ti tathā vadantaṃ. **idhā** (Sn 791d = Pj II 527,8) ti khandhādiloke micchāññāna. **vā** (Sn 791d) ti viparītasabhāvena pavattāya paññāya. **pakubbamāno** (Sn 791d = Pj II 527,8) ti abhisankhārādīni karonto. **assā** (Pj II 527,9) ti dutiyatatiya-catutthapādāsāṅkhātassa padassa. **aparan** (Sn 791a = Pj II 527,17) ti sathārādi. **visenibhūto** (Sn 793a = Pj II 527,29) ti ettha vigatā mā<ra>senā etassā ti viseni, visenibhūtvā bhavati ti visenibhūto. **dvinnam purekkhārānaṃ** (Pj II 528,10) ti taṇhādītṭhisāṅkhātānaṃ dvinnam purekkhārānaṃ. **assā** (Pj II 528,18) ti *ekapuggalādhitṭhānāya desanāya* (Pj II 528,17). **sambandho** (Pj II 528,19) ti tidesanāsambandho. **kiñca bhiiyo** (Pj II 528,18) ti katamaṃ guṇaṃ adhikaṃ vattabbaṃ siyā ti yojanā. **catunnam kilesasimānaṃ atitattā** (Pj II 528,20) ti: “catasso kilesasimāyo sakkāyadītṭhivīcīcīcā silabbata-parāmāso dītṭhānusayo vicīcīcānusayo tadekatṭhā ca kilesā ayaṃ pathamā simā, oḷārikaṃ kāmarāgasāññojanaṃ paṭighasāññojanaṃ oḷāriko kāmarāgānusayo <paṭighānusayo<sup>20</sup>> tadekatṭhā ca kilesā ayaṃ dutiyasimā, aṇusahagataṃ kāmarāgasāññojanaṃ paṭighasāññojanaṃ aṇusahagata<sup>21</sup> kāmarāgānusayo paṭighānusayo tadekatṭhā ca kilesā ca ayaṃ tatiyasimā rūparāgo arūparāgo māno uddhaccaṃ avijjā mānānusayo bhavarāgānusayo avijjānusayo tadekatṭhā kilesā ca ayaṃ catutthasimā. yato catuhi ariyamagehi imā catasso simāyo atikkanto hoti samatikkanto vitivatto<sup>22</sup> so vuccati simātigo<sup>23</sup>” ti evaṃ *Niddese* (Nidd I 99,24-100,5) vuttānaṃ catunnam kilesasimānaṃ atikkantattā. **itthambhūtassā** (Pj II 528,21) ti imaṃ guṇappakāraṃ pattassa. **tassā** (Sn 795a = Pj II 528,21)

<sup>20</sup> This has to be inserted following the text of Nidd I.

<sup>21</sup> Ms °vatā. \*

<sup>22</sup> Ms *vivitanto*.

<sup>23</sup> Ms. *simātike*.

98/2

khīṇāsavabrāhmaṇassa. **na virāgaratto** (Sn 795c = Pj II 528,25) ti viseso rāgo virāgo rūparūparāgo. virāgena ratto virāgaratto.

*Suddhatṭhakasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī* samattā (Pj II 528,28).

**yaṃ ānisaṃsaṃ passatī** (Sn 797a yad, cf. Pj II 529,28-30) ti yojanā. **nihinato** (Sn 797d = Pj II 530,2) ti nihinabhāvato. **kīdisan** (Pj II 530,10) ti kīdisaṃ *ditṭhiṃ na kappayeyyā* (Sn 799a) ti yojanā. **yā kappiyatī** (Pj II 530,12) ti yā dītṭhi dītṭhigatikehi<sup>24</sup> vikappiyati. **etaṃ dītṭhin** (Pj II 530,13 om. etaṃ) ti etaṃ tādisaṃ dītṭhiṃ. **hino na maññī<e>tha visesi vā pī** (Sn 799d = Pj II 530,15) ti. **hino** (Pj II 530,15) ti attānaṃ na maññeyya na avamaññeyya visesi avamaññeyya. **yaṃ pubbe gahitan** (Pj II 530,15) ti yaṃ pubbe gahitaṃ dītṭhigataṃ. **sa ve viyatthesū** (Sn 800c = Pj II 530,19 viyatthesū<sup>25</sup>) ti ettha sasaddassa attho so ti gahetabbo. **satthesū** (Pj II 530,20 sattesu) ti gatesu nānādītṭhigatesu. **phassādibhede** (Pj II 530,25<sup>26</sup>) ti phassa-samudayādibhedo bhayakotṭhāse. **nivesanā** (Sn 801c) ti taṇhādītṭhisāṅkhātā nivesanā. **dhammesū** (Sn 801d) ti dvāsattṭhi dītṭhidhammesu. **nivaccheyyā** (Sn 801d niccheyya) ti nicchinitvā samuggahitaabhinivītṭhā *nivesanā keci pi yassa na santi* (Sn 801c<sup>27</sup>) ti yojanā. **tesan** (Pj II 531,2) ti tehi khīṇāsavehi. **na paṭ<i>cchitā** (Pj II 531,3) ti na sampatīcchi.

*Paramattha*(sic)*suttavaṇṇanādīpanī* samattā (Pj II 531,7).

**jātakādīkathānaṃ** (Pj II 531,13 °kathanan) ti ettha ādisaddena saṃgaṇhāti. **ādinī** (Pj II 531,13) ti ettha ādisaddena heṭṭhā vuttāni tatraṭṭhitāni na ussukkasamudānatthan ti ādinī janapadacārikanimittāni saṃgaṇhāti. bhuttāvino bhagavato brāhmaṇo bhattaṃ niharāpesi<sup>28</sup> ti

<sup>24</sup> Ms. °gatiko hi.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. vv.11.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. v.l. B°.

<sup>27</sup> E° om. pi, cf. v.l. in B°.

<sup>28</sup> Reference unclear, cf.: *bhuttāvino brāhmaṇo pattam apanāmesi*, Pj II 532,13?

yojanā pubbe va sannivāsenā (Pj II 533,1\*) ti ettha vāsaddassa rassataṃ katan ti veditabbaṃ. pubbe sannivāsenā vā ti vuttaṃ hoti. tatha pubbe (Pj II 533,1\*) ti atitajātiyaṃ. sannivāsenā (Pj II 533,1\*) ti sahaṃvāsenā sahasaddass' atthe hi ayaṃ sasaddo. paccuppanāhitena vā (Pj II 533,1\*) ti paccuppanne vattamānabhāve hitacaraṇena vā, evaṃ imehi<sup>29</sup> dvīhi kāraṇehi taṃ sinehasaṅkhātaṃ pemaṃ jāyati (Pj II 533,2\* jāyate) uppajjati. idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti pemaṃ (Pj II 533,2\*) nām' etaṃ dvi<hi> kāraṇehi jāyati purimabhāve mātā pi<tā> vā dhītā vā putto vā bhātaro vā bhagini vā pati vā bhariyā vā sahāyo vā mitto vā hutvā yo yena saddhiṃ ekaṭṭhāne vuṭṭhapubbo tassa iminā pubbe vā sannivāsenā bhavantare pi anubandhanto so sineho na vijahati imasmi attabhāve katena puccuppannena hitena vā ti evaṃ imehi dvīhi kāraṇehi taṃ pemaṃ jāyati ti. kimpiyā ti āha: uppalaṃ vā (!) yathā (Pj II 533,2\*) ti etthāpi vāsaddassa rassataṃ katan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. avuttasampiṇḍattho c' ettha vāsaddo tena padumādayo saṃgaṇhāti. yathāsaddo upamāyaṃ. idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti yathā uppalaṃ ca sesaṃ ca padumā udake jāyamānā dve kāraṇāni nissāya jāyati. udakaṃ c'eva kalalaṃ ca tathā etehi dvīhi kāraṇehi pema jāyati ti. ṭhitiparitt<at>āyā (Pj II 533,29) ti ṭhiti<la>kkaṇassa parittatāya. sa<ra>-saparittatāya (Pj II 533,29) ti attano paccaya-bhūtānaṃ kiccānaṃ sampattinaṃ ca parittatāya. miyatī (Sn 804b = Pj II 533,31.33) ti maraṇaṃ gacchati. idan (Sn 805b = Pj II 534,1) ti mamāyitavatthūṃ. mama upāsako bhikkhu vā ti saṅkhaṃ gato (Pj II 534,3) ti mama upāsako mama sāvako vā bhikkhu vā māmako (Sn 806d) ti saṅkhā gato ti yojanā. mamāyamāno (Pj II 534,4) ti piyāyamāno. etaṃ ādinavaṃ disvā viditvā paṇḍito (Sn 806c) gahaṭṭho ca pabbajito ca mama sāvako tasmā ditṭhipamattāya mama attā mama santakan ti na nametha<sup>30</sup> (Sn 806d) na nameyyā ti sambandho. petan (Sn 807d) ti ito paralokagataṃ. kālakatan (Sn 807d) ti mataṃ. petassā (Sn 808d) ti matassa. jantuno (Sn 808d) ti sattassa. etan (Pj II 534,25) ti attano adassanaṃ. sāmaggīyaṃ āhu tassa tan (Sn 810d = Pj II

<sup>29</sup> Ms. *imamehi*, cf. on *pemaṃ*, Pj II 533,2\* below.

<sup>30</sup> Ms. *na mapetha*.

99/7

534,14) ti ettha gaṇadhammaanabhinibbattisaṅkhātesu tisu sāmaggīyesu tassa bhikkhuno anurūpavatthena anabhinibbattisāmaggīyaṃ anabhinibbatiadhipetaṃ. paṇṇe (Sn 811d) ti pokkharapatte<sup>31</sup>. ettha vā (Pj II 534,22) ti ditṭhasutesu<sup>32</sup> vā. tena vatthunā (Pj II 534,25) ti taṇhādītṭhisāṅkhāte<na> vatthunā.

*Jarāsuttavaṇṇanādīpanī* samattā.

tissame<tte>yyā (Pj II 536,7) ti ettha tissatissame<tte>yyā ti vattabbe ekasesasarūpekanayena<sup>33</sup> tissametteyyā ti vuttaṃ. pabbaj(!)āsaṅkhātenā (Pj II 536,16) ti pabbaj(!)ākoṭṭhāsena vā pabbajito ti samaṇo ti gaṇanāropanena vā. gaṇava[va]ssaggagatṭhena vā (Pj II 536,17) ti gaṇasaṅgaṇitārāmattaṃ vissajjtvā vavakatṭhena vā. bhāvan (Pj II 536,27) ti pavattanaṃ vadhanaṃ vā. methunan (Pj II 536,31) ti methunarāgaṃ. saṅkappehi (Pj II 536,31) ti kāmabyāpādādītṭhisāṅkappasaṅkhātehi. iminā kāraṇe[na]nā (Pj II 537,7) ti gilāno ahaṃ mātāpitatthe ca mayā bharitabbo ti ādinā kāraṇena. mosavajjan (Sn 819d = Pj II 537,12) ti musāvādaṃ. pubbāparaṃ (Sn 821b = Pj II 537,15 °pare) ti methunam anuyuttassa. pa. hīnam āhu puthujanan (Sn 815a-816b) ti pubbavuttaādinavato paraṃparabhūtaṃ. arahattanikūṭena desanaṃ niṭṭhapesī (Pj II 537,27) ti idha tissametteyya-sutte pubbe methunadhammo āgato upari arahattaphalaṃ āgataṃ hoti yasmā, tasmā phalanikūṭena pucchānusandhinā ca desanaṃ niṭṭhapesi.

*Tissametteyyasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī* samattā. (Pj II 537,30).

jambū (Pj II 538,5) ti jamburukkho. paññāṇan (Pj II 538,5) ti paññāya naṭṭhena paṭivādaṃ. anāsādentō (Pj II 538,7) ti paṭivacanādāyakaṃ puggalaṃ āpādetuṃ alabhamāno. kāraṇike (Pj II 538,22) ti yuttaṃ janante. paññāpaṭibhānan (Pj II 538,24) ti paññāya vattabbavacanaṃ. te (Pj II 540,4\*) ti yāni citrāni kāmāni te kāmētvā purisassa kāmo ti na

<sup>31</sup> Ms. °patto.

<sup>32</sup> Ms. *ditṭhisuttesu*.

<sup>33</sup> Ms. adds *yena* below the line.

vadesī (Pj II 540,4\*) ti yojanā. sarirā<kārā>kappesū (Pj II 540,15) ti sasarirāya vesagamanādiākappesu ca. idh' evā (Sn 824a = Pj II 540,31) ti imasmi ditthigate. aññesu dhammesū (Sn 824b) ti aññesu sāsana-dhammesu ditthidhammesu ca. paccekasaccesū (Sn 824d = Pj II 541,3) ti paccekaditthiasaccesu. te vādakāmā (Sn 825a) ti gāthā (Pj II 541,4) ti *te vādakāmā* (Sn 825a) ti-ādikā ayaṃ gāthā evaṃ nivittānaṃ micchādittikānaṃ visesā kā dassanavasena vuttā ti yojanā. te (Sn 825a) ti evaṃ nivittā ditthigatikā. bālato (Pj II 541,6) ti bālabhāvato. aññāsattthārādin (Pj II 541,7 aññamaññasa°) ti aññāṃ aññāṃ sattthārādin. ubho pi janā evaṃ saññino hutvā (Pj II 541,9) ti yojanā. evaṃ vadānesu cā (Pj II 541,10) ti kusalavadānesu, niddhāraṇe c'etaṃ bhummāṃ. pubbe va vādā (Pj II 541,14) ti vādato pubbe vādēna yujhanato pubbe ti attho. kathāṃkathāvinighātī (Pj II 541,14 °vinipātī) ti kathāṃkathāya dakkhī hoti. atthāpagatan (Pj II 541,15) ti atthato vigataṃ. te (Pj II 541,15) ti tayā. pañhavimāṃsakehī (Pj II 541,15) ti pañhassa yuttāyuttabhāvaṃ jānantehi. ariparihite<sup>34</sup> (Pj II 541,16) chaḍḍite ti attho. vāde (Pj II 541,17) ti mañkubhūtassa ditthikassa vade. evaṃ apāhatasmi ca vāde (Pj II 541,17) ti bhāvalakkhaṇe bhummāṃ hetumhi vā. yam assa vādan (Sn 827a) ti yaṃ tassa ditthikassa vādaṃ. yam assa vādan (Sn 827a) ti gāthā (Pj II 541,20) ti ayaṃ gāthā bhagavatā yathā vuttā gāthā dukkhaṃ pāpuṇāti ti yojanā. pañhaṃ vimāṃsakā se (Sn 827b) ti ettha se ti nipātamattam pañhaṃ vimāṃsakārino pārisajjā ti attho. anaññāyā (Pj II 541,22) aññāṃ mayā ! ti ajānitvā. āvajjitan (Pj II 541,22) ti cajjitaṃ. tassa jayo (Pj II 541,23) ti tassa paṭivādapuggalassa jayo. jayaparājayādivasena (Pj II 541,28) ti ettha ādisaddena lābhālābhādayo saṃgaṇhāti. ugghātan (Pj II 541,28) ti ugghatabhāvaṃ. nighātan (Pj II 541,29) ti heṭṭhāgatabhāvaṃ. ugghāti nighātimā cā (Pj II 541,29 va<sup>35</sup>) ti etthā ugghāti ca nighāti cā ti ugghātinighāti assa atthi ti ugghātimā etthā ti vādesu. sundaro ayan (Pj II 541,34) ti ayaṃ puggalo sundaro ti. tattha ditthiyā (Sn 829a = Pj

<sup>34</sup> So ms., read *aparihārite*, E' *apasādite*, cf. v.II.1

<sup>35</sup> Cf. v.I. B': ca in E'.

190/7

II 541,31) ti tassa ditthiyaṃ, nimittatthe c' etaṃ bhummāṃ. dīpetvā (Pj II 542,1) ti ayaṃ *akkhāyā* (Sn 829b) ti imassa attho. jayatthenā (Pj II 542,2) ti jayaśākhātena atthena hetubhūtena. dantaṃ vidāṃsabhāvā (Pj II 542,2) dantavidāṃsakaṃ ti dantapakāsakataṃ. yā uṇṇatī ti gāthā (Pj II 542,5) ti yā uṇṇatī (Sn 830a) ti-ādikā gāthā tassa uṇṇamantassa ditthigatikassa dosadassanavasena vuttā<sup>36</sup> ti yojanā. vighātabhūmi (Sn 830a = Pj II 542,6) ti piḷanabhūmi. yā uṇṇamati<sup>37</sup> (Sn 830a uṇṇati) ti yā mānaśākhātaṇṇamaṇā. sāssa vighāta-*<bhū>mi* (Sn 830a) ti sā tassa [puggalavighātami (!) ti sā tassa]<sup>38</sup> puggalassa vighātabhūmipiḷanabhūmi. tenā (Pj II 542,13) ti ditthigāhākādinā. suddhin (Sn 830d) ti nibbānasuddhiṃ. kusalā (Sn 830d) ti khandhaāyatanādisu chekā puggalā. taṃ vādaṃ asam-paṭicchakato (Pj II 542,8 °paṭicchanto) ti pi pātho. ettha pi ṭvidhijhaṭ na vivādayethā ti taṃ vādaṃ sampatiṇṇantassa puggalassa ti attho. bhāṭapathena<sup>39</sup> (Pj II 542,10) ti raññā dinnabhattamatena. puttḥo (Pj II 542,10) vuttam ! ti positivo āpādiko vaḍḍhiko ti attho. etī (Pj II 542, 12) ti gacchati. idhā (Sn 832c) ti mama santāne nesanti khināsavānaṃ. ye (Sn 833a) ti ye atinto khināsavo<sup>40</sup>. carantī (Sn 833a) ti viharanti. ditthihi (Sn 833b) ti dvāsattī ditthihi. paramam ugghātan (Sn 833d<sup>41</sup>) ti idaṃ paramaṃ aggaṃ seṭṭhaṃ ti ugghātaṃ abhinivittānaṃ ajhositaṃ. kotthuādayo (Pj II 542,24) ti sigālādayo.

*Pasūrasuttavaṇṇanāḍipani*<sup>42</sup> samattā (Pj II 542,27).

ukkuṭikan (Pj II 544,1\*) ti asampuṭṭhamajhaṃ. anukaḍḍhitan (Pj II 544,2\*) ti pādanikkhepasamaye<sup>43</sup> pacchato añchitaṃ. sahasānupīḷitan

<sup>36</sup> Ms. *puttā*.

<sup>37</sup> Ms. *uṇṇamānāti*.

<sup>38</sup> Dittography.

<sup>39</sup> Ms. °*mathena*.

<sup>40</sup> Read *atintā khināsavā?*

<sup>41</sup> Cf. v.I. B' in E'!

<sup>42</sup> Ms. *Papura*°.



(Pj II 544,3\*) ti aggapādena paṇhiyā ca sahasā sannirumbhitam. **vippakatā** (Pj II 544,5) ti anīṭhitā. **abhikāman** (Pj II 544,21) ti maṃ icchantam idan (Sn 835c = Pj II 544,23) ti rūpaṃ *kā[ma] nāssā* (cf. Pj II 544,28?<sup>44</sup>) ti kā na assa. **saccāni** (Pj II 545,9) ti cattāri ariyasaccāni. **vadati** (?<sup>45</sup>) ti māgaṇḍiyam<sup>46</sup> brāhmaṇo vadati. **purisabyatayan** (Pj II 545,23 °ttayam) ti pathamapurisassa uttamaādesavasena purisavipalāsam katvā. **dasavatthukam sammādiṭṭhin** (Pj II 545,26) ti atthi dinnam atthi yiṭṭham atthi hutam atthi sukataṃ dukatānam vipāko atthi pitā atthi mātā atthi sattā opapātikā atthi ayam loko atthi paraloko atthi loka samaṇā brāhmaṇā ye imaṃ ca lokaṃ paraṃ ca lokaṃ abhijānītvā pavedenti vā evam dasavatthukasamādiṭṭhi. **navanṅam savanan**<sup>47</sup> (Pj II 545,27) ti tassā dasavatthukāya sammādiṭṭhiyā savanam. **tesū** (Pj II 545,30) ti dasavatthukasammādiṭṭhiādisu. **atamayatāpajjanenā** (Pj II 545,34 °mm°) ti nitaṇhabbhāvam āpajjanena<sup>48</sup>. **yuttasaññan** (Pj II 546,16) ti samaṇadhamme paṭiladdhasaññam. **tassā** (Sn 842d = Pj II 546,24) ti tassa mayham na hoti. **paṭisamyujjeyyā** (Sn 843d = Pj II 546,34<sup>49</sup>) ti paṭiyujjeyyā<sup>50</sup>. **saman** (Sn 843c = Pj II 546,32) ti samānam. **rūpadhātvādī** (Pj II 547,1 rūpavathādī°) ti ettha ādisaddena vedanāsaññāsankhāradhātuyo saṃgaṇhāti. **rūpanimittaniketādīni** (Pj II 547,2) ettha ādisaddena saddagandharasapoṭṭhabbadhammanikete saṃgaṇhāti. **puthubhūto** (Pj II 547,5) ti visum bhūto. **mutarūpādibhedāyā** (Pj II 547,24) ti ettha mutam rūpanāma<sup>51</sup> gandharasaphoṭṭhabbāni ādisaddena sarasakhobhādayo saṃgaṇhāti. **kāmādhikaraṇan** (Pj II 548,4) ti

<sup>44</sup> Ms. *pādapaṭicekkhapasamaye*, cf. *pādanikkhepasamaye kaḍḍhanto viya pādam nikkhipati ten' assa padam anukaḍḍitam pacchato añchitam hoti*, Vism-mhṭ on Vism 105,4\*

<sup>45</sup> E° *kā nu assa diṭṭhi*. The exact reference to Pj II remains uncertain.

<sup>46</sup> Reference in Pj II uncertain.

<sup>47</sup> Ms. has consistently *-nd-*.

<sup>48</sup> Ms. *na ca tam savanan!*

<sup>49</sup> Corrected from *āpajjanassa*.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. v.l. B° in E°.

<sup>51</sup> Ms. *paṭisamyu°*, °sam° cancelled.

<sup>52</sup> Thus after correction from *nāmarūpa°*.

101/7

kāmahetukam. **dhammādhikaraṇan** (Pj II 548,5) ti diṭṭhidhammakāraṇam.

**Māgaṇḍiyasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī** samattā (Pj II 548,9)

**uppattiyan** (Pj II 548,14) ti sabhāvalakkhaṇe<sup>52</sup> bhummam. **uttā** ti (Pj II 548,15 vuttā) vuttā va. **devatānam cittaṃ ṇatvā** (Pj II 548,20) ti ruddhacaritadevatānam cittācāram ṇatvā. **Sammāparibbājanīyasuttam** (Sn 359-375) hi rāgacaritānam devatānam bhagavā kathesi dosacaritānam **Kalaha** <vi> **vādasuttam** (Sn 862-877) mohacaritānam **Mahābyūhasuttam** (Sn 895-914) saddhācaritānam **Tuvaṭakapaṭipadam** (Sn 915-934 Tuvaṭakasutta) buddh<i>caritānam **Purābhedasuttam** (Sn 848-861) vitakkacaritānam **Cuḷabyūhasuttam** (Sn 878-894) kathesi<sup>53</sup>. **pucchāyā** (Pj II 548,24) ti pucchāgāthāya. **kathamdassī** (Pj II 548,24) ti kīdisena dassanena samannāgato. **kathampsilo** (Pj II 548,25) ti kīdi[va]sena silena samannāgato **upasanto** (Pj II 548,29) ti nibbuto[

The six *suttas* mentioned above are grouped together in the same way already in the Sumaṅgalavilāsini: Sv 682,18-23.

Freiburg i. Br.

Oskar von Hinüber

<sup>52</sup> Ms. *yabāva°*.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Pj II 548,12-14 and 361,26-28.

102/7

1997

## Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā on the History of Lān Nā's Buddhism<sup>1</sup>

### General Aspects of Lān Nā's Historical Literature

Lān Nā's numerous and fact-filled historical works consist of secular and religious writings, are written in Mon, Pāli or Thai Yuan languages with Mon, Thai (Fak Khām) or Tham letters, and can be short descriptions of one particular event or longer accounts through the ages.

Mon dominated the region from about A.D. 750 to 1300 when the Thai rose to power. The oldest surviving documents are Mon inscriptions on stone with dates shortly after 1200; a few undated inscriptions may be somewhat older.<sup>2</sup> The oldest Thai inscription with a date is from 1371 (Wat Phra Yün, Lamphün)<sup>3</sup> though here again some undated inscriptions may be older.<sup>4</sup> The oldest Thai palmleaf manuscript with a date is part of a Jātaka book in Pāli from 1471.<sup>5</sup> Inscriptions are the only true primary sources. Of other texts, which usually were written on palmleaf, we do not have the originals, only

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is a revised and enlarged version of the paper *Literature on the History of Local Buddhism*, presented at the 1st Conference on Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā, "A Survey of Present Knowledge and Suggestions for Future Activities", held at Wat Suan Dòk, Chiang Mai, 15-16 November 1994.

<sup>2</sup> Texts and translations for instance in: Halliday 1930 *Inscriptions môn*.

<sup>3</sup> Text and translation for instance in: Griswold / Prasöt 1974 *Inscr. Wat Phra Yün*.

<sup>4</sup> See for instance: Penth 1988-89 *Inscriptions and Images*; Penth 1992 *Thai Literacy*.

<sup>5</sup> v.Hinüber 1993 *Pāli und Lāna*: 223.

copies of copies. Thus, there are no original manuscripts of any of the chronicles. Climate and insects necessitated copying to preserve a text.

Lān Nā's authors wrote solely on their own history or, at the most, on the old history of Buddhism in India and Ceylon. The accent of their writings is mostly on one locality in Lān Nā or on one single item such as an image; other regions are mentioned mainly to show that a local item or feature was derived from there, or was moved to there. Lān Nā's authors did not write the history of other peoples, nor did they note down the customs of other peoples, whether these populations were living outside their area or within Lān Nā itself. Thus, for instance, there is no work on the history of the local Lawa, no description of them as a different people, and no old Lawa word list; there is no history, for instance, of China, of a neighbouring Burmese kingdom, nor of Sukhōthai, Ayuthayā. There is also no comprehensive history of Lān Nā. There are, it is true, some chronicles that deal with many places in and outside Lān Nā; but that is not because of wide historical interest on the part of the authors but because their subject, for instance the history of the Wat Suan Dòk monks and their school (MS), or the history of the Wat Pā Dāng school (JKM), or the history of Chiang Mai (CMA), necessitated dealing with other places. Nonetheless, in particular the last two chronicles are more broad-minded in outlook than others and could be read as Lān Nā histories with a strong accent on Chiang Mai. One can therefore state that Lān Nā's historical works are basically locality-centered or item-centered. In that, Lān Nā was not alone, most other regions in Southeast Asia had a similar self-centered way of writing only their own history; but it is clearly different from, for instance, old China or old Rome, where the history, languages and customs of other peoples received much attention.

If the authors of old have not left us an account of the Lawa who lived among them, neither have they left us an account of the life of the ordinary Mon or Thai person. The texts mostly enumerate events, political, military and religious, nearly always in neat chronological order. Causal connections are sometimes explained, are often obvious, occasionally not. Treating important events, the texts deal mostly with higher-ranking individuals, leaders of government, military, and clergy.

With the authors' interest limited to events in their own country, *mūang*, their own region, or their own monastery or school, their outlook was limited geographically. Their outlook was also limited intellectually in the sense that they did not compare; certainly they did not critically compare and evaluate in writing, though one imagines occasional lively discussions among learned monks. But in their writings, authors did not, for instance, compare their own people's history with the history of other populations in order to look for similarities or generalities, did not compare obviously similar accounts of several different famous Buddha statues as a starting point for an investigation into these similarities, did not compare conflicting evidence on one and the same subject for a study into the reason behind the difference. Since there was no comparing, there was no weighing or reasoned choosing between contradictory sources. It seems that there also was a complete absence of historical speculation or historical philosophy, for instance as to the meaning of history, or to its usefulness for present everyday life or for future generations. And they probably never abstracted, summarized a chain of related events. One can therefore further characterize Lān Nā's historical works as mostly plain, enumerative and descriptive, and her historians as mainly recorders and compilers.

However, that limited, enumerative event-descriptiveness is the very strongpoint of Lān Nā's historical literature. Authors did not

104/7

choose between two diverging sources but stated them both; they had the highest respect for the written word and did not lightly change, add to, or 'correct' what they found noted by their forefathers, an attitude at present still prevalent among the senior generation. Therefore, in spite of errors and sometimes accidental 'jumps' while copying which resulted in lacunae in the copied text, today's historian can with a good deal of confidence work with the material that has been handed down - if something appears unintelligible, there is a fair probability that he (or she) does not understand the matter properly, and not that the text is corrupt.

With regard to its historical qualities, Lān Nā's literature can roughly be divided into two categories: factual history and fictional or mythical, legendary history. This paper is meant to treat literature dealing with factual history. However, Lān Nā's factual history literature sometimes is not without legendary or mythical elements.

### Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā on the History of Lān Nā's Buddhism

A major part of Lān Nā's historical literature was created by past local Mon and Thai authors who wrote on, or noted contemporary events of, the factual history of their religion in Lān Nā. These texts can be classed as Lān Nā's Buddhist literature dealing with the factual history of Lān Nā's Buddhism and can be divided into 6 groups:

1. General religion chronicles
2. Chronicles of Buddha images
3. Chronicles of religious sites
4. Inscriptions
5. Colophons
6. Other

The lists below are meant to be suggestions or examples only; they are neither complete nor perfect in all details. Some dates are tentative. Items with Pāli text are marked by an asterisk \*.

### 1. General Religion Chronicles

- ± 1425      Buddhañāṇa begins *Mūlasāsanā* (MS).
- 1516-17    \* Ratanapañña writes the first part of *Jinakālamāli* (JKM). The second or last part ends with the year 1527.

### 2. Chronicles of Buddha Images

Ratanapañña in his JKM quite often mentions Buddha images and usually remarks on their history. Of some of the images, he reproduces their entire history. These accounts are among the earliest known versions of image chronicles.

Some images are not mentioned in JKM (for example: Phra Silā, Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai); possible explanations are: the images then were not yet in Chiang Mai; they were mentioned in sections lost from JKM;<sup>6</sup> their chronicles were written after 1527.

The image Phra Kāo Khāo (Phra Setangka Manī, Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai) has a chronicle in Thai but not in Pāli.

Phra Kāo Mòrakot has at least one chronicle version in Laotian / Yuan, and three in Pāli.

<sup>6</sup> All known JKM manuscripts have a total gap between 1455 and 1476. Also, they do not report on JKM's principal monastery, Wat Pā Dāng near Chiang Mai, between 1453 and 1516.

The Sāvattī Sandalwood Image (Phra Kān Jan) originally seems to have had a chronicle in Thai which Ratanapañña was the first to translate into Pāli for his JKM under the name *Varacandanasāranidāna*.

±1410 \* Bodhiraṃsi composes (or translates from Thai) the chronicle of Phra Sing, *Sihṅga(buddharūpa)nidāna* (SIN).

? An unknown author writes in Yuan dialect the chronicle of Phra Kān Jan (KJ), i.e. of the Sāvattī Sandalwood Image.

±1500 \* Brahmarājapañña writes a history of Phra Kāo Mōrakot (Emerald Buddha), *Ratanabimbavaṃsa* (KM-B).

The following 4 chronicles are in Ratanapañña's JKM.

1516-17 \* History of Phra Sing, *Sīhaḷapaṭimā* (SIN-JKM).

1516-17 \* History of Phra Kāo Mōrakot, *Ratanapaṭimā* (KM-JKM).

1516-17 \* History of Phra Sikhī, *Sikhībuddha* (SIK-JKM).

1517-27 \* History of Phra Kān Jan (Sāvattī Sandalwood Image), *Candanapaṭimā*, *Candanabimba* (KJ-JKM).

±1575 \* Ariyavaṃsa (was he a Yuan ?) writes a history of Phra Kāo Mōrakot (Emerald Buddha), *Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna* (KM-A).

±1575 \* Ariyavaṃsa (same as of KM-A) writes a history of Phra Bāng, *Aḍḍhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna* (PB). Written in Wiang Jan ?

1785 \*Phra Mahā Phōtha Langkā orders to write the history of Phra Silā (SIL).

? An unknown author writes the history of the Buddha image Phra Setangka Manī (Setaṃgamaṇi, Phra Kāo Khāo) (SET).

105/7

### 3. Chronicles of Religious Sites

These chronicles, of which there are plenty, often consist of a common myth: the Buddha comes and makes predictions, leaves a hair, leaves a footprint, etc. The myth frequently explains the name of the future religious site. Sometimes the myth is followed by genuine historical material which describes events that indeed took place. One could call these histories *myth-chronicles*. Their date of composition is mostly unknown. They probably did not have a definite author and a definite year of composition because they presumably developed orally during a long time and later were written up. Here are some examples:

1565 Composition of the chronicle of Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai (HAR).

1606 (or later) The HAR appendix is written.

1631-1812 Composition of the chronicle of Phra Thāt Dòl Tung (DT); but see also: inscription 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sān 1605.

Chronicles of religious sites can contain episodes which are more or less similar to stories contained in *Phra jao liap lōk* "The Lord (circum-)tours the World", also known as *Tamnān phra bāt phra thāt* "History (or: The Origins) of the Holy Footprints and Relics", collections of legendary travels of the Buddha through Lān Nā and environment among the four Thai peoples, Siamese, Yuan, Khūn and Lü.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> There are numerous versions of greatly varying length and contents. A general edition would be most welcome. For a tentative classification of the various versions see: Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thāt Dòl Tung: 64. It seems that so far only a few isolated mss have been studied and occasionally been distributed in polycopied form ("semi-published"); for

## 4. Inscriptions

Inscriptions mostly deal with one specific event that took place at a certain time, for instance the erection of a building at a monastery or the founding of a Buddha statue.

While chronicles easily belong to the category 'literature', it is often difficult to decide whether a certain inscription is 'literature'. In a broad sense, all inscriptions, whether on stones, on Buddha images, on bells, etc., can be called 'literature' concerning the history of local Buddhism. This is particularly true for longer inscriptions which sometimes are well-phrased and parts of which are written in verse or rhyme. However, very short inscriptions can hardly be regarded as being genuine 'literature'. It will be up to the individual reader to decide where to draw the line. Here are a few examples.

- 1219 \* Inscr. 1.3.1.1 Wat Dòn 1219; stone; Pāli and Mon languages.
- 1411 Inscr. 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411; stone; *kham ham* verse.
- 1470 \* Inscr. 1.2.3.2 Wat Phra Jao Meng Rāi 1470; on a bronze 'Phra Sing' Buddha image.<sup>8</sup>
- 1477 \* Inscr. 1.5.3.2 Wat Phayā Ruang 1477; on a bronze Buddha image.

instance: Sommāi 1967 Tamnān Mūang Fāng. (Incidentally, the title of the ms is a misnomer because the ms is a *Phra jao liap lōk* text and does not deal with Fāng's history.)

<sup>8</sup> 'Phra Sing' means a certain image but also a type of Buddha image in general. There are several images with inscriptions stating that it is a 'Phra Sing'. This statue is one of them. The 'real' Phra Sing, dealt with in SIN, is claimed to be an image either in Chiang Mai, Bangkok, or Nakhòn SĪ Thamma Rāt; none of these three images is inscribed.

106/7

- 1605 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sān 1605; on a bronze image of a hermit (*rūsī*, ṛṣi). Contains the earliest known version of the Dòì Tung chronicle.

See below under 'INSCRIPTIONS' for their publication.

## 5. Colophons

Similar to inscriptions which record, for instance, the founding of an image and are laid down on the pedestal of the image, palmleaf manuscripts (on any subject) may have at the end of the text proper a post-script or colophon that is of general historical interest and that also often bears on the history of local Buddhism because it records details about the writing of the manuscript: author, copyist, sponsor, costs, date, place, circumstances, etc. Some colophons are very short and can hardly be called 'literature'; others are longer, highly informative and also well-written. Colophons are sometimes omitted by copyists, in text editions or translations (and overlooked by their readers).

While instructive colophons are relatively frequent, their opposite, viz. informative prologues, are rare.<sup>9</sup>

See below under 'COLOPHONS' for their publication.

## 6. Other

There are secular chronicles which have a definite religious accent in that they prominently report on religious activities, for

<sup>9</sup> For instance: prologue to *Cāmadevīvaṃsa* by Bodhirāṃsi, c.1410. In: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 44 n.2; CDV.P+Y/T'1967: 1-2.

107/7

instance on construction work at monasteries. They are not 'Buddhist historical literature' in a strict sense but complement other Buddhist writings on the history of local Buddhism. To mention only one example:

± 1410 \* Bodhiramsi translates from Thai *Cāmadevīvaṃsa* (CDV).

Finally must be mentioned certain secular chronicles and other historical writings which technically lie outside the field of 'Buddhist historical literature' yet are not unrelated: they can contain versions of old pieces of Buddhist historical writings, they deal occasionally with objects, events and persons connected with Buddhist writings on the past, and they therefore contribute to a better understanding of such writings. To mention only two well-known chronicles:

- ±1806 Completion of the 7-fascicle ('bundle') version of the Chronicle of Chiang Mai (CMA).
- ±1827 Completion of the 8-fascicle version of the Chronicle of Chiang Mai (CMA).
- ±1895 Composition of the Chronicle of Nān (NAN).

## Texts and their Publications

### Note on Abbreviations

In the list below, texts are arranged in alphabetical order while their publications are in chronological order.

The list avoids titles (prince, etc.) but personal rank-titles attached to such ranks as phra, luang, etc., have been retained and authors are listed under these because they usually are better known.<sup>10</sup>

The first letters, before the 'decimal point', indicate the name of a text; for instance: KM = the chronicle of Phra Kāo Mōrakot, i.e. the Emerald Buddha image.<sup>11</sup>

If there are several text versions of the same story, a hyphen indicates the version; for instance: KM-A = history of Phra Kāo Mōrakot according to the thera Ariyavaṃsa.

The letters after the 'decimal point' indicate the modern editor of the text, or the translator, by his initials; for instance: KM-A.CN = Translation of KM-A into French by Camille Notton.

It is sometimes useful or even necessary to indicate the language; for instance: SIN.SM/P and SIN.SM/T, meaning that the

<sup>10</sup> Here are some frequently mentioned names and personal titles:

Chām Bunnāk = Phrayā Prachākit-kōrajak ชำ บุนนาค, พระยาพระชาภิจักรจักร

Kāo = Phrayā Thammaparōhit แก้ว, พระยาธรรมปโรหิต

Nōi = Phra Wichianprichā น้อย, พระวิเชียรปรีชา

Phā Tālalaksamon = Luang Prasōt Aksōranit = Phrayā Pariyati-thamthādā แพ ตาลละลักษมณ์, หลวงประเสริฐ อักษรนิศัพท์, พระยาปริยัติธรรมธาดา

Sitthi Lōjanānon = Phrayā Yānawijit สิทธิ โลงจานนท์, พระยาญาณวิจิตร

<sup>11</sup> If in future more texts are to be scrutinized, classified, etc., using the initials of two or three words in the title or name of a text will no longer be enough to clearly distinguish between different texts. One possible solution could be to follow the system of the Critical Pāli Dictionary and to use the first 5 letters of the name of a text instead; for instance: JKM = Jinak (Jinakālamālī), CDV = Cāmad (Cāmadevīvaṃsa), SIN = Sihinā (Sihinā(buddharūpa)nidāna). That would work well for Pāli titles; but for the less uniform Yuan titles adaptations will be necessary.

chronicle of the Buddha image Phra Sing (SIN) was edited by Säṅg Monwithūn (SM) in Pāli (P) and also translated by him into Thai (T). Other abbreviations: E = English, F = French.

If the same text was repeatedly published, it can be useful to indicate the year of publication; for instance: KM-A.CN'1933.

#### Note on Text Editions and Transcriptions

In the case of inscriptions that are written in Mon, Pāli or Thai languages and archaic alphabets, also in the case of palmleaf manuscripts written in Pāli, text editions usually are in the form of a transcription that is an exact transliteration, letter by letter, (called คำจารึก, อักษรเพลง) from the original alphabet into Roman or Thai characters. This gives the modern reader a precise idea of the orthography used in the old text. These transliterations are frequently accompanied by a Modern Thai Reading (called คำอ่านปัจจุบัน) to facilitate understanding; here, modern orthography and explanatory footnotes are used to assist the reader.

But in the case of chronicles written in Yuan dialect and in Tham or Fak Khām letters, text editions practically always are liberal transpositions into modern Thai (called *pariwat* ประวัติ), i.e. a form of Modern Thai Reading. Here, modern and original orthography are mixed to produce a quickly readable modern version with old local flavour, the degree of mixture being individually decided by each editor. These transpositions do not permit reconstruction of the original orthography but only of the wording; they come close to translations.

#### CDV

*Cāmadevīvaṃsa*. A Pāli version of the history of Old Lamphūn, *History of Nāṅg Jām Thewī* (NJT), translated c.1410 from Thai

108/2

(Deyyabhāsā) into Pāli (bhāsā Paḷībyañjana akkhara) by the mahāthera Bodhiraṃsi. The text has 15 chapters. The end of chapter 4 and the whole of chapters 5 and 6 are missing in all known manuscripts. Probably at an early date one or more bundles of a certain palmleaf manuscript were lost and all our presently known manuscripts go back to that one defective manuscript. Contents: From the visit and prophecy of the Buddha concerning the city until Ādittarāja (c. 1150).

#### CDV.PK

Translation of CDV into Thai by Phrayā Prachākit-kòrajak (Chām Bunnāk).

In: Wachirayān, 9, 1898-99.<sup>12</sup>

#### CDV.WL

Pāli text edition of CDV in modern Thai characters, probably prepared by officials in the Wachirayān National Library from an unspecified manuscript in that Library.

In: Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvaṃsa.

#### CDV.P+Y

Translation of CDV.WL into Thai by Phrayā Pariyati-thamthādā and Phrayā Yānawijit.

In: Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvaṃsa.

Fine Arts Dept 1967 Cāmadevīvaṃsa.

#### CMA

The Chronicle of Chiang Mai. The known 7-fascicle ('bundle') versions end in 1805/06 while the 8-fascicle versions end in 1827. The title

<sup>12</sup> The journal *Wachirayān* was published between 1884-1905 by the Royal Wachirayān Library, predecessor of the Wachirayān National Library, itself predecessor of the present National Library.



usually is *Tamnān Phūn Mūang Chiang Mai* ตำนานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่  
 "Historical Account of the Past of Chiang Mai" but for as yet unknown  
 reasons some manuscripts have the title *Tamnān Sip-hā Rāchawong*  
 ตำนาน 15 ราชวงศ์ "Historical Account of the 15 Reigns".

## CMA.CN

Translation of a 7-fascicle version of CMA into French by Camille  
 Notton.

In: Notton 1930 Annales (3).

## CMA.TT

Text edition of an 8-fascicle version of CMA in modern Thai by Thon  
 Tonman.

In: Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

## COLOPHONS

Colophons to *Cāmadevīvaṃsa* (Bodhirāṃsi, c.1410)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 43 n.2.

CDV.P+Y'1967: at the end of each chapter.

Colophon to *Sihīṅganidāna* (Bodhirāṃsi, c.1410)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 43 n.3.

Colophons to commentaries to *aṭṭhakathās* of Buddhaghosa  
 (Nāṇakitti, c. 1495)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 40 n.3; 41 n.1-3.

Colophon to KM (*Brahmarājapañña*, c.1500)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 46 n.2.

Colophon to *Vessantaradīpanī* (Sirimaṅgala, 1517)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 41 n.4.

109/7

Colophon to *Saṅkhyapakāsaka-ṭīkā* (Sirimaṅgala, 1520)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 39 n.2.

Colophon to *Maṅgaladīpanī* (Sirimaṅgala, 1524)

In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 40 n.1.

Colophon to JKM (1527)

In: JKM.WL/P'1908: 187-188.

JKM.WL/T'1908: 250-251.

JKM.GC/P in Cœdès 1925 Documents: 4-5 n.1 (not at the end of  
 the JKM text!).

JKM.SM/T'1958: 152-153.

JKM.J/E'1968: 185-186.

Various other colophons and related observations are in:

v.Hinüber 1987 Pāli Manuscripts at the Siam Society.

Hundius 1990 Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts.

v.Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons.

v.Hinüber 1993 Pāli und Lānā.

## DT

The chronicle of the religious site Phra Thāt Dòì Tung, twin stūpas  
 (jedī, cetiya) on a high hill overlooking the Chiang Sān plain, about 50  
 km north of Chiang Rāi.

## DT.HP

Text edition of DT in modern Thai based on the manuscript from Wat  
 Huai Khrai near Dòì Tung and collated with a greater number of other  
 DT manuscripts and one inscription (see also below: Inscriptions).

In: Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thāt Dòì Tung.

**HAR**

The chronicle of Phra Thāt Hariphunchai, Lamphūn, written in Yuan characters and dialect. Contents: From the earliest existences of the Buddha to 1565, with an additional episode dated 1606.

**HAR.FAD'1942**

In: Fine Arts Dept 1942 Prachum Tamnān (1).

**HAR.FAD'1962**

Text edition of HAR in modern Thai, based on the manuscript 'Phāyap letters' อักษรไทยพายัพ no.21 of the National Library, Bangkok.

In: Fine Arts Dept. 1962 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai.

**HAR.SW**

Text edition of HAR in modern Thai by Singkha Wannasai, based on several manuscripts and earlier text editions.

In: Singkha 1973 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai.

• Several times reprinted by Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai as a part of other publications of the monastery, for instance in 1974 and 1987.

**INSCRIPTIONS****1.2.3.2 Wat Phra Jao Meng Rāi 1470**

In: Griswold 1957 Dated Buddha Images: no.1.

Penth 1976 Jārük phra Phuttha rūp: no.2.

**1.3.1.1 Wat Dòn 1219**

In: Cœdès 1915 Documents: 189-192.

Halliday 1930 Inscriptions môn: 87-90 (does not contain the Pāli text).

Jampā et al. c.1990 Wikhrò: 88-101.

**1.4.3.2 Dòi Tung 1605**

In: Penth et al. 1993 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sān 1605.<sup>13</sup>

**1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411**

In: Thöm / Prasān 1980 Silā Jārük Kasat Lò Phò./9.

**1.5.3.2 Wat Phayā Ruang 1477**

In: Griswold 1963 Yudhiṣṭhira: 226-27.

Sinchai / Jintanā 1974 Aksòn nūa: 107 (only the Pāli text).

Thöm / Bunlòt 1987 Jārük Yuthisathira.

**JKM**

The chronicle *Jinakālamālī* (or *Jinakālamālinī*). Written in Pāli, the chronicle traces the history of Buddhism from India and Ceylon to Lān Nā. It deals specifically with a new local school, the Sīhaḷabhikkhus who installed themselves in 1430 in Wat Pā Dāng near Chiang Mai, then records in detail the activities of the Wat Pā Dāng monks first until 1517, and finally for another 10 years until 1527. The author (at least of the first part, up to 1517) was Ratanapañña, writing in Wat Pā Dāng.

There is an explanatory index to the Thailand part of the chronicle with comments on places, objects and events: Penth 1994 JKM Index. Cf. *ibid.* p.335-342 for details of JKM manuscripts and text editions.

<sup>13</sup> It has since been established that the inscribed object (a bronze statue of a hermit) originally was kept on Dòi Tung, hence the change in name of the inscription in the Archive of Lān Nā Inscriptions.

111/7

## JKM.WL/P

Pāli text edition of JKM in Thai letters arranged by the Royal Wachirayān Library.

In: Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamāli (1). ('Prince Damrong Edition').

## JKM.WL/T

Translation of JKM.WL/P into Thai by Phrayā Phojanāphimon and others, made in 1794, omitting certain difficult passages.

In: Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamāli (2).

## JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of JKM (only the Thailand part) in Roman letters by George Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 4-5; 36-72.

## JKM.GC/F

Translation of JKM.GC/P (only the Thailand part of the chronicle) into French by George Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 5; 73-140.

## JKM.SM

Translation of JKM into modern Thai by Säng Monwithün.

In: Säng 1958 Jinakālamāli; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 81-153.

Säng 1967 Jinakālamāli; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 90-171.

## JKM.NJ

Translation of JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 96-186.

## KJ

History of the Buddha image Phra Jao Kān Jan (Sandalwood Buddha Image). There were two of them: one made in Sāvattthī, and one in Chiang Sān (see JKM). KJ deals with the Sāvattthī image and calls the story *Varacandanasāranidāna*. But no Pāli text of that name seems to exist, the known manuscripts are in Thai Yuan and are usually called Tamnān Phra (Jao) Kān Jan. Ratanapañña presumably translated a Thai version into Pāli for his Jinakālamāli.

## KJ-JKM

An account in Pāli of KJ in the second part (1517-27) of the chronicle Jinakālamāli.

## KJ.PY

An account of KJ by Phrayā Prachākit-kōrajak in his Phongsāwadān Yōnok, presumably based on several Yuan manuscripts.

In: Prachākit 1907 Phongsāwadān Yōnok: 250-252.

## KJ-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of KJ-JKM in roman letters by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 69-70.

## KJ-JKM.GC/F

Translation of the Pāli text of KJ-JKM into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 135-37.

## KJ-JKM.NJ

Translation of KJ-JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands: 178-180.

## KJ-JKM.SM

Translation of KJ-JKM into Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1958 *Jinakālamāli*: 145-147.

Säng 1967 *Jinakālamāli*: 163-166.

## KJ.SC

An account of KJ in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 *Prachum Tamnān* (2): 68-88. English abstract in

Penth 1994 *JKM Index*: 324-326.

## KM

Chronicle of the Buddha image Phra Kāo Mōrakot (Emerald Buddha). There are 3 Pāli versions by 3 different authors, Ariyavaṃsa (KM-A), Brahmarājapañña (KM-B), and Ratanapañña in his *Jinakālamāli* (KM-JKM). They probably did not copy from each other but rather used common Thai sources which Brahmarājapañña calls "Siamese language" (*syāmbhāsā*) in the colophon and which, in the case of Ariyavaṃsa, presumably in part is taken from a chapter of the Chronicle of Lān Chāng.<sup>14</sup>

There are also reports of Laotian versions in Luang Phra Bāng, one of which is well-known in Thailand (KM-LP), and I have heard and read of (but not seen) Yuan manuscripts in north Thailand.

## KM-A

History of the Emerald Buddha according to Ariyavaṃsa: *Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna*. - Contents: From the creation of the image, initiated in 44 B.C. by the thera Nāgasena of Pāṭaliputta and sculpted by the god Vissukamma, to the death of King Jaya Jetṭha in

<sup>14</sup> See also: Cœdès 1915 *Ouvrages palis*: 46; Lingat 1932 Rev. Notton 1932 *Emerald Buddha*; Lingat 1935 *Le culte*.

112/7

1571 when the image is in Wiang Jan. - Date and place of composition are not clear. Two likely dates may be 1643 and 1725; the chronicle perhaps was written at Wiang Jan. The Pāli text may not yet have been published.

## KM-A.X

Translation of KM.A into modern Thai by an unnamed (?) person. - Contents: From Nāgasena to 1565 (correct: 1571 ?), when the image is in Wiang Jan, with a jump to 1778-80 when the image is removed to Bangkok.

In: Julalongkōn 1920 *Phra Rācha Karanyānusōn*: 81-105.

Julalongkōn 1964 *Phra Rācha Karanyānusōn*: 107-136.

## KM-A.CN

Translation of KM-A from a Pāli - Yuan *nissaya* into English by Camille Notton. The Yuan text seems to have had enlargements over the Pāli text of the *Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna*.

In: Notton 1932 *Emerald Buddha*.

Notton 1933 *Emerald Buddha*.

## KM.B

History of the Phra Kāo Mōrakot as told by Brahmarājapañña. The author translates old Thai texts into Pāli and calls his work *Ratanabimbavaṃsa*. - Contents: From the creation of the image by Nāgasena until the image is in Lampāng. - Date and place of composition are indicated in the text but have not yet been identified.

## KM-B.TP

Translation of KM-B into modern Thai by Phrayā Thammaparōhit. Finished in 1788, printed in 1937.

In: ... (No details available to me).

**KM-B.PA/P**

Pāli text edition of KM-B in modern Thai letters probably by Luang Prasöt Aksòranit.

In: Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong.

**KM-B.PA/T**

Translation of KM-B into modern Thai by Luang Prasöt Aksòranit.

Probably in: Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong.

**KM-B.SM**

Translation of KM.B into modern Thai by Säng Monwithūn, occasionally with Pāli passages.

In: Säng 1967 Ratanaphimphawong.

**KM-JKM**

History of the Phra Kāo Mòrakot according to Ratanapañña, 1516-17, in his *Jinakālamāli*. The story ends in 1481, when the image is installed in the Jedī Luang, Chiang Mai.

**KM-JKM.GC/P**

Pāli text edition of KM-JKM in roman letters by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 53-56.

**KM-JKM.GC/F**

Translation of KM-JKM into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 112-115.

**KM-JKM.SM**

Translation of KM-JKM into Thai by Säng Monwithūn.

In: Säng 1958 *Jinakālamāli*: 114-118.

Säng 1967 *Jinakālamāli*: 128-133.

**KM-JKM.NJ**

Translation of KM-JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 *The Sheaf of Garlands*: 141-145.

**KM-LP**

Text edition (?) of KM in modern Thai, based on a Laotian version from Luang Phra Bāng.

In: Wichianprīchā 1869 *Phongsāwadān Nūa*: Appendix.

Wichianprīchā 1894 *Phongsāwadān Nūa*: Appendix (reprint of the 1869 edition).

Prachum Phongsāwadān, 1, 1914, 79-112 (reprint of the 1894 PN and KM texts).

Prachum Phongsāwadān, 1, 1963, 79-112 (reprint by Kāo Nā Publishers).

• The KM printings of 1869 and 1894 have the title *Tamnān Phra Kāo Mòrakot Luang Phra Bāng*, but in Prachum Phongsāwadān the title is shortened to *Tamnān Phra Kāo Mòrakot*.

**KM.PY**

An account of KM by Phrayā Prachākit-kòrajak in his *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*, presumably based on several Yuan manuscripts.

In: Prachākit 1907 *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*: 246-248.

**KM.SC**

An account of KM in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 *Prachum Tamnān* (2): 1-35.

**MS**

*Mūlasāsanā*. A chronicle of Buddhism and related secular events in India, Sri Lanka and Thailand, with emphasis on Lān Nā and the araññavāsī monks of Wat Suan Dòk near Chiang Mai. Contents: From the beginning of Buddhism in India to its advent in central and north

Thailand, on to the founding of Wat Suan Dòk in 1371 and up to about 1510. In a way, MS is a chronicle of Wat Suan Dòk as JKM is a chronicle of Wat Pā Dāng. But MS is much less scholarly and thus probably mirrors a basic difference between the two araññavāsī sects. All known versions of MS are written in Tham letters and Yuan dialect and are rather uniform. MS as it is known today is the result of an original version with later additions: it seems that the abbot of Wat Suan Dòk, Buddhāñāna, composed the first part in around 1425 and that later the abbot Buddhabukāma (whose identity is not clear)<sup>15</sup> and perhaps others continued it.

## MS.S+P

Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Sut Sīsomwong and Phrom Khamālā, based on a manuscript in the Bangkok National Library.

In: Sut/Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā.

Sut/Phrom 1970 Mūlasāsanā.

## MS.PN

Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Prasöt na Nakhòn (Prasert na Nagara), based on MS.S+P and collated with other MS manuscripts.

In: Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā.

## NAN

The Chronicle of Nān.

## NAN.RS

Text edition of NAN in modern Thai by Sān Luang Rācha Somphān สนั่นหลวงราชสมภาร, based on one or several Yuan manuscripts. - The prince of Nān, Suriyaphong Phritadet สุริยพงศ์มริตเดช, ordered it

<sup>15</sup> Griswold / Prasöt 1972 King Lōdaiya: 53-54; Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā: 286 n.1.

compiled in 1894 after his accession. The last date mentioned is 1894. Though there were, and perhaps still exist, older versions written or copied in the years after 1800, it is this version which is generally used today.

In: Rācha Somphān 1919 Nān History.

## NAN.P+W

An abridged translation of Part 2 and the first two sections of Part 3 of NAN.RS into English by Prasöt Churatana, checked and edited by David Wyatt.

In: Prasöt/Wyatt 1966 Nān Chronicle.

## NAN.W

Translation of NAN into English by David Wyatt.

In: Wyatt 1994 Nān Chronicle.

## NJT

History of Nāng Jām Thewī. Contents: The Buddha visits the future site of Lamphūn (Hariphunchai) and makes prophecies; followed by a short biography of queen Jām Thewī; followed by a relation of events in Lamphūn up to the last Mon king of the city, Yībā, when the Thai Yuan king, Mang Rāi, conquers the city. Dates are few and unreliable.

Mahāthera Bodhirāṃsi translated the original Thai text (which at least for its earlier part would have been derived from old Mon texts, oral or written) into Pāli in about 1410 under the name of *Cāmadevīvaṃsa* (CDV). Since then, there are 2 lines of text tradition: the old Thai line (History of Nāng Jām Thewī, NJT) and the new Pāli line (*Cāmadevīvaṃsa*, CDV). The CDV has been re-translated into modern Thai; it differs somewhat from the known versions of NJT, perhaps because NJT evolved more during the time than CDV.

## NJT.AP

Translation of NJT from a Laotian manuscript in Luang Phra Bāng dated A.D.1646 into French by Auguste Pavie and assistants. There is an appendix with a list of Chiang Mai rulers from Mang Rāi to Fā Sawāthi.

In: Pavie 1898 *Etudes diverses* (2): 145 - 166 ('Histoire de Nang Kiam Tévt').

## NJT.CN-Ams

Translation of NJT from a Yuan palmleaf manuscript which is not described (here called "manuscript A") into French by Camille Notton.

In: Notton 1930 *Annales* (2): 1-58.

## NJT.CN-Bms

Translation of NJT from a Yuan palmleaf manuscript which is not described (here called "manuscript B") into French by Camille Notton. The translation covers only the story of Nāng Jām Thewī in a condensed way.

In: Notton 1930 *Annales* (2): 58-60.

## SET

History of the Buddha image Phra (Kāo) Setangka Manī (Setaṅgamaṇi; in Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai), or Phra Kāo Khāo. Only in Yuan dialect, no Pāli version is known. - The history of the image is also mentioned in NJT.CN-Ams: 1-3. There is often confusion in texts between Phra Kāo Mōrakot, Phra Kāo Khāo, and Phra Setangka Mani.

## SET.PY

Summary of SET by Phrayā Prachākit-kōrajak in his *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*, presumably based on a number of Yuan manuscripts.

In: Prachākit 1907 *Phongsāwadān Yōnok*: 244-245.

## SET.EH

Summary of SET by E.W.Hutchinson, based on a transcription from Yuan into Thai made by the monk Phra Mahā Mūn of Wat Hò Tham, Chiang Mai. That transcription was based on Mahā Mūn's palmleaf manuscript which itself had been copied in 1920 at Wat Rampōng from another manuscript.

In: Hutchinson 1935 *Sacred Images*.

Hutchinson 1954 *Sacred Images*: 55-58.

## SET.CN

Translation of SET from a manuscript in Yuan dialect (and probably in Tham letters) into French by Camille Notton.

In: Notton 1936 *Phra Setangka Manī*.

## SIK

History of the Buddha image Phra Sikhī, one of the five Ayuthayā Black Stone Images, made from a black rock on which the Buddha once had rested near Ayuthayā. The image was originally presented to Angkor Thom, then to Pagan, to Lampāng (until 1515) from where it was forcefully removed to Ayuthayā.

## SIK-JKM

Ratanapañña's version of SIK in the first part (1516-17) of his chronicle *Jinakālamāli*.

## SIK-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of SIK-JKM by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 *Documents*: 60-61.

## SIK-JKM.GC/F

Translation of SIK-JKM from Pāli into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 *Documents*: 123-125.

## SIK-JKM.SM

Translation of SIK-JKM from Pāli into Thai by Sāng Monwithūn.

In: Sāng 1958 Jinakālamāli: 125-128.

Sāng 1967 Jinakālamāli: 141-144.

## SIK-JKM.NJ

Translation of SIK-JKM from Pāli into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands: 155-158.

## SIL

History of the Buddha Image Phra Silā at Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai, perhaps written in 1785 at Pā Sāng at the request of Phra Mahā Phōtha Langkā; there seem to be Pāli and Yuan versions. - Contents: King Ajātaśatru of Magadha (today: Bihār, north India) orders to make the image. It is later removed to Langkā, Burma, Sawankalōk, Lampāng, Chiang Mai. - The shape of the letters of the inscription around the head of the image (Ye dhammā ...) and the style of the image suggest that it was made soon after 900 in Bihār.<sup>16</sup>

## SIL.EH

A (shortened ?) translation of SIL from Yuan into English by E.W.Hutchinson, based on a Yuan version made by the monk Phra Mahā Mūn of Wat Hò Tham, Chiang Mai. Phra Mahā Mūn had translated the Yuan version himself from a Pāli version and had put both side by side in his own manuscript.

In: Hutchinson 1935 Sacred Images.

Hutchinson 1954 Sacred Images: 59-62, 70-73.

<sup>16</sup> Lohuizen 1961 Stone Buddha.

116/7

## SIL.X

An account of SIL in modern Thai by an unnamed person, published by Wat Chiang Man in 1956.

In: Wat Chiang Man 1956 Tamnān Phra Silā.

## SIL.SC

An account of SIL in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 Prachum Tamnān (2): 54-67.

## SIN

History of the Buddha image Phra Sing (Phra Sihing, Phra Phuttha Sihing). Composed in Pāli or translated from Thai into Pāli c.1410 by the mahāthera Bodhiramṣi under the title *Sihinga(buddharūpa)nidāna*. The history of the image is also told by Ratanapañña in the first part (1516-17) of his chronicle Jinakālamāli (SIN-JKM). - This history has repeatedly been printed in various forms; below are listed only some examples. More are listed in Sāng 1963 Tamnān Phra Sing: 80.

## SIN.PA/P

## SIN.PA/T

Pāli text edition together with a translation of SIN into modern Thai by Luang Prasöt Aksòranit. Published under Prince Damrong in 1913 for a private printing made by the Royal Historical Research Society (Porāṇagatisamosara)<sup>17</sup> or the Wachirayān Library (Hò Phra Samut)<sup>18</sup>.

In: Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing.

Wachirayān Library 1918 Tamnān Phra Sing.

## SIN.CN

Translation of SIN.PA/T into English by Camille Notton.

In: Notton 1933 Phra Sing.

<sup>17</sup> Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 43, n.3.

<sup>18</sup> Thanit Yūphō in: Sāng 1963 Nithān Phra Sing: Preface.



## SIN.SM/P

Pāli text edition of SIN in modern Thai characters by Säṅg Monwithūn.

In: Säṅg 1963 Nithān Phra Sing.

## SIN.SM/T

Translation of SIN.SM/P into Thai by Säṅg Monwithūn.

In: Säṅg 1963 Nithān Phra Sing.

## SIN.SC

An account of SIN in modern Thai by Sanguan.Chōtisukharat.

In: Sanguan 1972 Prachum Tamnān (2): 36-52.

## SIN-JKM

Ratanapañña's version of SIN in his chronicle Jinakālamāli.

## SIN-JKM.GC/P

Pāli text edition of SIN-JKM by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 46-48.

## SIN-JKM.GC/F

Translation of SIN-JKM from Pāli into French by G. Cœdès.

In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 97-102.

## SIN-JKM.SM

Translation of SIN-JKM from Pāli into Thai by Säṅg Monwithūn.

In: Säṅg 1958 Jinakālamāli: 100-105.

Reprinted in 1967: p.112-118

## SIN-JKM.NJ

Translation of SIN-JKM from Pāli into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.

In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands: 120-126.

117/7

## Bibliography

Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis

G. Cœdès: Note sur les ouvrages palis composés en pays thai. BEFEO, 15.3, 1915, 39-46.

Cœdès 1925 Documents

G. Cœdès: Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental. BEFEO, 25, 1925, p.1-200.

Fine Arts Dept 1942 Prachum Tamnān (1)

กรมศิลปากร "ประชุมตำนานพระธาตุ ภาคที่ 1" กรุงเทพฯ 2485.

Fine Arts Dept. 1962 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai

กรมศิลปากร "ตำนานพระธาตุหริภุญชัย ฉบับหอสมุดแห่งชาติ" กรุงเทพฯ 2505.

Fine Arts Dept 1967 Cāmadevīvaṃsa

กรมศิลปากร "คำแปล จามเทววงศ์ พงศาวดารเมืองหริภุญชัย" เชียงใหม่ 2510.

• Partial reprint of Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvaṃsa. Does not contain the Pāli text, only the Preface by Prince Damrong and the Thai translation CDV.P+Y/T.

Griswold 1957 Dated Buddha Images

A.B. Griswold: Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam. Ascona 1957.

Griswold 1963 Yudhiṣṭhira

A.B. Griswold: Prince Yudhiṣṭhira. Artibus Asiae, 26.3-4, 1963, 215-229.

Griswold / Prasöt 1972 King Lōdaiya

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: King Lōdaiya and his Contemporaries. JSS, 60.1, 1972, 21-152.

Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yün

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Inscription of Wat Phra Yün. JSS, 62.1, 1974, 123-141.

- Halliday 1930 Inscriptions mōn  
R. Halliday: Les inscriptions mōn du Siam. BEFEO, 30.1-2, 1930, 81-105.
- v. Hinüber 1987 Pāli Manuscripts at the Siam Society  
Oskar von Hinüber: The Pāli Manuscripts kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A short Catalogue. JSS, 75, 1987 p.9-74.
- v. Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons  
Oskar von Hinüber: On some Colophons of Old Lanna Pāli Manuscripts. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies, 11-13 May 1990. Kunming 1990, Vol. IV, 56-77.
- v. Hinüber 1993 Pāli und Lānnā  
Oskar v. Hinüber: Pāli und Lānnā (Nord-Thai) in den Kolophonen alter Palmblatthandschriften aus Nord-Thailand. In: Gerhard Meiser: Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix. Innsbruck, 1993, 223-236.
- Hundius 1990 Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts  
Harald Hundius: The Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts From Northern Thailand. JPFS, 14, 1990, 1-173.
- Hutchinson 1935 Sacred Images  
E.W. Hutchinson, Sacred Images in Chiangmai. JSS, 28.2, 1935, 115-143.
- Hutchinson 1954 Sacred Images  
E.W. Hutchinson: Sacred Images in Chiangmai. In: Siam Society 1954 Fiftieth Anniversary (2): 54-73.  
• Reprint of Hutchinson 1935 Images.
- Jampā et al. (1990) Wikhrō  
จัมปา เบ็ญจวิญญู / เข็ม มีดิม / คงเดช ประสิทธิ์นันทกุล "วิเคราะห์  
ศิลปะ "บ้านเกิด" ศิลปะชนเผ่าชนชาติ ทริภุมไชย" กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร  
พื้ดงวิญญู (1) (กรุงเทพฯ พ.ศ.2533).

- Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands  
N.A. Jayawickrama: The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conqueror, Being a Translation of Jinakālamālipakaraṇam of Ratanapañña Thera of Thailand. London, 1968.
- Julalongkōn 1920 Phra Rācha Karanyānusōn  
"พระราชกรัณยานุสร พระราชนิพนธ์ในรัชกาลที่ 5 ตอนว่าด้วย พระราชพิธีศรี  
สังฆานกาล" กรุงเทพฯ หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณ ร.ศ. 2463.
- Julalongkōn 1964 Phra Rācha Karanyānusōn  
พระบาทสมเด็จพระจุลจอมเกล้าเจ้าอยู่หัว "พระราชกรัณยานุสร" กรุงเทพฯ สำนัก  
พิมพ์คลังวิชา 2463 • Second printing of Julalongkōn 1920 Phra Rācha  
Karanyānusōn.
- Lingat 1932 Rev. Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha  
R. Lingat (reviews): Camille Notton: The Chronicle of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok 1932. BEFEO, 32, 1932, 526-530.
- Lingat 1935 Le culte  
R. Lingat: Le culte du Bouddha d'Émeraude. JSS, 27.1, 1935, 9-38.  
• Contains an analysis of the sources and the history of the Emerald Buddha, Phra Kāo Mōrakot.
- Lohuizen 1961 Stone Buddha  
J.E. van Lohuizen - de Leeuw: The "Stone Buddha" of Chiangmai and Its Inscription. Artibus Asiae, 24.3-4, 1961, 324-329.
- Notton 1930 Annales (2)  
Camille Notton: Annales du Siam, 2e volume, Chronique de Lap'un - Histoire de la dynastie Chamt'évi. Paris, 1930.
- Notton 1930 Annales (3)  
Camille Notton: Annales du Siam, 3e volume: Chronique de Xieng Mai. Paris 1932.

- Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha  
Camille Notton: The Chronicle of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok, 1932.
- Notton 1933 Emerald Buddha  
Camille Notton: The Chronicle of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok, 1933, Second Impression.
- Notton 1933 Phra Sing  
Camille Notton: P'ra Buddha Sihinga. Bangkok, 1933.
- Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2)  
Auguste Pavie: Mission Pavie. Etudes diverses (2): Recherches sur l'histoire du Cambodge, du Laos et du Siam. Paris, 1898.
- Penth 1976 Jārūk phra Phuttha rūp  
ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “คำจารึกที่ฐานพระพุทธรูปในนครเชียงใหม่” กรุงเทพฯ สำนักนายกรัฐมนตรี 2519.
- Penth 1988-89 Inscriptions and Images  
Hans Penth: Inscriptions and Images on the Phra Mahā Thāt in Lamphūn. *Artibus Asiae*, 49.3-4, 351-369.
- Penth 1992 Thai Literacy  
Hans Penth: Thai Literacy. *Bulletin of the Archive of Lan Na Inscriptions*, 4, 1992, 19-112.
- Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thāt Dòl Tung  
ฮันส์ เพนธ์ (บรรณาธิการ, พรรณเพ็ญ เครือไทย และ ศรีเลา เกษพรหม ผู้ช่วยบรรณาธิการ): คณะกรรมการค้นคว้าวิจัยประวัติพระธาตุดอยตุง (รวบรวม) “ประวัติพระธาตุดอยตุง” กรุงเทพฯ (ธนาคารไทยพาณิชย์) 2536. Contains the editor's Preface in Thai and English.
- Penth et al. 1993 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sän 1605  
ฮันส์ เพนธ์ / พรรณเพ็ญ เครือไทย / ศรีเลา เกษพรหม “จารึก 1.4.3.2 เชียงแสน พ.ศ.2147/A.D.1605” *จุลสารคลังข้อมูลจารึกล้านนา*, 5, 2536/1993, 65-81.

119/7

- Penth 1994 JKM Index  
Hans Penth: Jinakālamālī Index. An annotated Index to the Thailand Part of Ratanapañña's Chronicle Jinakālamālī. The Pali Text Society, Oxford / Silkworm Books, Chiang Mai, 1994.
- Prachākit 1907 Phongsāwadān Yōnok  
พระยาประชาธิปไตยจักร “เรื่องพงษาวดารโยนก” กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ. ๑๒๖.
- Prasöt / Wyatt 1966 Nān Chronicle  
Prasoet Churatana / David K. Wyatt: The Nan Chronicle. Ithaca, Cornell University, 1966.
- Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā  
ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “ตำนานมูลศาสนา” กรุงเทพฯ 2518.
- Rācha Somphān 1919 Nān History  
สนทลวงราชสมภาร “เรื่องราชวงศ์ปกครอง” ใน ประชุมพงศาวดาร, 10, 2462.
- Rācha Somphān 1964 Nān History  
สนทลวงราชสมภาร “เรื่องราชวงศ์ปกครอง” ใน ประชุมพงศาวดาร ฉบับหอสมุดแห่งชาติ, 10, 2507.  
• Reprint of the 1919 edition by Kāo Nā Publishers สำนักพิมพ์ก้าวหน้า, เล่ม ๔.
- Säng 1958 Jinakālamālī  
แสง มนวิฑูร “ชินกาลมาลีปกรณ์” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2501.
- Säng 1963 Nithān Phra Sing  
แสง มนวิฑูร “นิทานพระพุทธรูปสังค” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2506.
- Säng 1967 Jinakālamālī  
แสง มนวิฑูร “ชินกาลมาลีปกรณ์” เชียงใหม่ กรมศิลปากร 2501.  
• Reprint of Säng 1958 Jinakālamālī
- Säng 1967 Ratanaphimphawong  
แสง มนวิฑูร “รัตนพิมพ์วงศ์ ตำนานพระแก้วมรกต พระภิกษุพรหมราชปัญญา แต่งเป็นภาษามาลี” กรุงเทพฯ 2510.

Sāng 1980 Buddhism

Saeng Chandragnaam (ed.): Buddhism in Northern Thailand. Chiang Mai, 1980. (Published on the occasion of "The 13th Conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists, 24-29 November 1980 at Chiang Mai").

Sanguan 1972 Prachum Tamnān

สงวน ไชติสุวรรณ์ "ประชุมตำนานลานนาไทย" กรุงเทพฯ 2515 (2 เล่ม).

Siam Society 1954 Fiftieth Anniversary

The Siam Society: The Siam Society fiftieth Anniversary Commemorative Publication. Selected Articles from The Siam Society Journal. Bangkok, 1954, 2 vols.

Sinchai / Jintanā 1974 Aksòn nūa

สินชัย กระบวนแสง / จินตนา ตรีสวรรณ "อักษรไทยภาคเหนือ" กรุงเทพฯ กรมการฝึกหัดครู 2517.

Singkha 1973 Tamnān Phra Thāt Hariphunchai

สิงฆะ วรรณสัย "ตำนานพระธาตุหริภุญไชย" ลำพูน 2516.

• Several times reprinted by Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai as a part of other publications of the monastery, for instance in 1974 and 1987.

Sommāi 1976 Tamnān Müang Fāng<sup>19</sup>

สมหมาย เปรมจิตต์ "ตำนาน เมือง ผาง" คณะสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัย เชียงใหม่ ๒๕๑๙ (ภาคปริวรรตลำดับที่ ๑๒) / Sommai Premchit: Muang Fang Chronicle, Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University, 1976, 42 pp.

Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsānā

สุด ศรีสมวงศ์ / พรหม ขมาลา "ตำนานมูลศาสนา" กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2482.

<sup>19</sup> For this misnamed ms, which actually contains another text, see above footnote 3.

12077

Sut / Phrom 1970 Mūlasāsānā

สุด ศรีสมวงศ์ / พรหม ขมาลา "ตำนานมูลศาสนา" กรุงเทพฯ / เชียงใหม่ กรมศิลปากร 2513.

• Reprint of Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsānā.

Thöm / Prasān 1980 Silā Jārük Kasat Lò Phò./9

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง "ศิลาจารึกกษัตริย์ราชวงศ์มังราย ลพ./9" ศิลปากร, 24.2, 2523, 85-88.

Thöm / Bunlöt 1987 Jārük Yuthisathira

เทิม มีเต็ม / บุญเลิศ เสนานนท์ "จารึกฐานพระพุทธรูปพระเจ้ายุธิษฐิระ" ศิลปากร, 31.4, 2530, 80-82.

Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai

ทน ตนมั่น (ปริวรรต) "ตำนานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่" กรุงเทพฯ สำนักนายกรัฐมนตรี 2514.

Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamāli

1. (หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณฯ) "หนังสือชินกาลมาลินี พระยาพจนานิมล แปล" กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.127

2. (หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณฯ) "หนังสือชินกาลมาลินี ภาษามคธ" กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.127

• The book consists of 2 separate volumes. One volume contains a preface by Prince Damrong Rajanubhab and a JKM translation by Phrayā Phojanāphimon and others made in 1794 (JKM.WL/T); the other contains a JKM text edition in Pāli, the "Prince Damrong edition" (JKM.WL/P).

Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong

(?) หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณฯ "หนังสือรัตนพิมพ์วงษ์" กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.131.

Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing  
(Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince; ed.) “ตำนานพระพุทธรูป” กรุงเทพฯ  
(2456).<sup>20</sup>

Wachirayān Library 1918 Tamnān Phra Sing  
(Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince; ed.) “ตำนานพระพุทธรูป” กรุงเทพฯ  
(2456).<sup>21</sup>

- Reprint of Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing.

Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvaṃsa  
หอพระสมุดวชิรญาณฯ “จามเทวีวงศ์ พงศาวดารเมืองหริภุญไชย” กรุงเทพฯ  
2463.

Wat Chiang Man 1956 Tamnān Phra Silā  
(วัดเชิงม่น) “ตำนานพระศิลา” เชียงใหม่ 2499 (24 pp.).

Wichianprīchā 1869 Phongsāwadān Nūa  
Phra Wichianprīchā (Nōi): Phra Rācha Phongsāwadān Nūa lā Tamnān  
Phra Kāo Mōrakot Luang Phra Bāng. Bangkok 1869.<sup>22</sup>

- Contains as an appendix: KM-LP.

Wichianprīchā 1894 Phongsāwadān Nūa  
(พระวิเชียรปรีชา [น้อย]) “ตำนานพระราชพงษาวดารเหนือ และตำนานพระ  
แก้วมรกตเมืองหลวงพระบาง” กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ.113.

- Reprint of the 1869 edition incl. KM-LP.

Wichianprīchā 1914 Phongsāwadān Nūa  
(พระวิเชียรปรีชา [น้อย]) “พระราชพงษาวดารเหนือ” ประชุมพงษาวดาร, 1,  
2457, 1-78.

- Appendix p.79-112: ตำนานพระแก้วมรกต (= KM-LP' 1914).

<sup>20</sup> Hypothetical reconstruction of author, title, place and year. See above:  
SIN/PA.

<sup>21</sup> Same as footnote 16 above.

<sup>22</sup> Hypothetical reconstruction on the basis of what is known of the 1894  
edition.

Wichianprīchā 1963 Phongsāwadān Nūa  
(พระวิเชียรปรีชา [น้อย]) “พระราชพงษาวดารเหนือ” ประชุมพงษาวดาร ฉบับ  
หอสมุดแห่งชาติ, 1, 2457, 1-78.

- p.79-112: ตำนานพระแก้วมรกต (= KM-LP' 1963)
- Reprint of the 1914 edition by Kāo Nā Publishers สำนัก  
พิมพ์ก้าวหน้า, เล่ม ๑.

Wyatt 1994 Nān Chronicle

David K. Wyatt (translator and editor): The Nan Chronicle. Southeast  
Asia Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1994.

- Thich Thien Chau (1987): Thich Thien Chau, "Les réponses des Pudgalavādin aux critiques des écoles bouddhiques", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10/1, pp. 33–53
- Venkataramanan (1953): K. Venkataramanan (tr.), "Sāmmitīyanikāya Śāstra", *VBA V*
- Vogel (1985): Claus Vogel, "Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures", in Bechert (1985) 104–10
- Wang (1994): Bangwei Wang, "Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes", in *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-funden, Beiheft 5, Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, Göttingen, pp. 165–203
- Watters (1904–5): Thomas Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India (A.D. 629–645)*, London (repr. New Delhi, 1973)
- Willemen (1973): Charles Willemen, "The Prefaces to the Chinese Dharmapadas, Fa-chü ching and Ch'u-yao ching", *T'oung Pao* LIX, pp. 203–19
- Willemen (1974): Charles Willemen, *Dharmapada: A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dharmapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*, Brussels
- Willemen (1978): Charles Willemen, *The Chinese Udānavarga: A Collection of Important Odes of the Law, Fa Chi Yao Sung Ching*, Brussels (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques XIX)
- Willson (1986): Martin Willson, *In Praise of Tārā: Songs to the Saviouress*, London
- Yuyama (1980): Akira Yuyama, "Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period", in Bechert (1980) 175–81

## New Pāli Inscriptions from South-east Asia

### I. A RECENTLY DISCOVERED PĀLI INSCRIPTION FROM NAKHON PATHOM\*

In October 1991 the Institute of Western Thai Culture, Silpakorn University, held an exhibition on "The Archaeological Sites in Western Thailand" at the Sanamchandra Palace, Nakhon Pathom. The exhibition catalogue included a brief note, in Thai and English, accompanied by photographs, on a "New inscription found from Dvāravatī site in Western Thailand".<sup>1</sup> A reading of the inscription, with a Thai translation, was published in the same year by Naiyana Prongthura *et al.*, with larger and clearer plates.<sup>2</sup> According to the latter, the inscription was presented to Silpakorn University, Sanamchandra Palace Campus, by the abbot of Wat Taku (Amphoe Muang, Nakhon Pathom) in BE 2532 [CE 1989]. The abbot received it from a villager from district Nakhon Chaisi (Nakhon Pathom province); no further details regarding the nature of the find-spot or the date of discovery are available.

\* An earlier version of this article was published under the title "Preliminary Report on a Recently Discovered Pāli Inscription" in the *Journal of the Office of the Supreme Patriarch's Secretary (Warasanchotmaikhao Samnaklekhanukansomdetphrasangharat)*, Vol. I, No. 1, (2535 [1992]), pp. 83–86. The earlier version was based only on the "exhibition catalogue" (see n. 1); the present revision takes into account the work of Naiyana *et al.* (see n. 2), and gives an improved reading of the inscription and some additional references.

<sup>1</sup> Phasook Indrawooth *et al.*, *Laeng boranakhadi nai phumiphak tawantok / The Archaeological Sites in Western Thailand*, Silpakorn University Press, Nakhon Pathom, 1991, pp. 112–13 and Pl. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Naiyana Prongthura *et al.*, "An inscription on a rectangular bar in the Pallava script in the Cultural Project Centre, Silpakorn University, Sanamchandra Palace Campus, Nakhon Pathom" (in Thai), in *Phasa-Charuk*, Part 3, published in celebration of the sixth cycle of Prof. Dr. Prasert Na Nagara, Silpakorn University, Bangkok, 2534 [1991], pp. 40–44.

The text is neatly engraved in ornate Pallava characters on a rectangular stone bar measuring 30.7 by 5.2 cm., with two lines on each of the four long sides. The exhibition catalogue dates the inscription to the 12th century BE [circa 550–650 CE], and notes that it bears “the essence of the Buddha’s Teaching: Ariyasacca (The Four Noble Truths) and Paṭiccasamuppāda (The Law of Causation)”. Naiyana dates the inscription to the 12–13th century BE [circa 550–750 CE].

### 1. Transcription

The transcription given here follows the order in which the photographs occur in the exhibition catalogue and that given by Naiyana *et al.*, with the four sides of the bar numbered from A to D.

- A.1. *śrī // dukkha samudaya nirodha magga avijjā saṃkhāra viññāṇa nāmarūpa*  
 A.2. *salāyatana phassa vedanā tanhā upādāna bhava jāti jarā maraṇa //*  
 B.1. *cattāro satipaṭṭhānā cattāro saṃmappadhānā cattāro iddhipādā pañcendriyāni*  
 B.2. *pañcabalāni satta bojjaṅgā ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo sattatiṇsa bodhipakkhiyadhamma<sup>3</sup>*  
 C.1. *abhiññeyyaṃ abhiññātaṃ bhāvetavvañca bhāviṭaṃ*  
 C.2. *pahātavvaṃ pahīnaṃ me tasmā buddho 'smi brāhmaṇa //*  
 D.1. *dukkhaṃ dukkhasamuppādaṃ dukkhassa ca atikkamaṃ ariyañ caṭṭhaṅgikaṃ maggaṃ dukkhūpasamagāmina[m] //*  
 D.2. *iṭṭi buddho abhiññāya dhammam akkhāsi bhikkhūnaṃ dukkhass' antakaro satthā cakkhumā parinibbuto //*

<sup>3</sup> It is not clear whether the stone reads -a or -ā.

### 2. Discussion

A) Side A may be divided into two parts. The first lists the four Truths of the Noble Ones (*ariya-sacca*), from *dukkha*, suffering, to *magga*, the path; the second lists the twelve links of dependent arising (*paṭiccasamuppāda*), from *avijjā*, ignorance, to *jarā-maraṇa*, ageing-and-death.

The four Truths of the Noble Ones are given in an inscription from Sārnāth in India<sup>4</sup> and in a number of inscriptions from Siam.<sup>5</sup> From an early but as yet undetermined date, it was a practice to place the inscribed text of dependent arising within or upon *thūpas* or *cetiya*s, as shown by numerous inscriptions in Pāli, Prakrit, Sanskrit, and Chinese, from India, Siam, Burma, Malaya, Java, and Central Asia.<sup>6</sup>

B) Side B lists the “37 factors conducive to enlightenment” (*bodhipakkhiya-dhamma*) in seven groups in ascending numerical order:

- the 4 foundations of mindfulness (*cattāro satipaṭṭhānā*);  
 the 4 right efforts (*cattāro saṃmappadhānā*);  
 the 4 bases of success (*cattāro iddhipādā*);

<sup>4</sup> See Sten Konow, “Two Buddhist Inscriptions from Sārnāth”, *Epigraphia Indica* IX (1907–08), § 43.

<sup>5</sup> See Peter Skilling, “A Buddhist Verse Inscription from Andhra Pradesh”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 34 (1991), pp. 239–46, especially p. 244 and notes thereto, and Part II of the present article.

<sup>6</sup> For references see Oskar von Hinüber, “Epigraphical Varieties of Continental Pāli from Devnimori and Ratnagiri”, in *Buddhism and its Relation to Other Religions: Essays in Honour of Dr. Shozen Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday*, Kyoto, 1985, pp. 185–200. For Java see J.G. de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia* II, Bandung, 1956, § III; for Central Asia, see Hubert Durt *et al.* “A propos de ‘stūpa miniatures’ votifs du Ve siècle découverts à Tourfan et au Gansu”, *Arts asiatiques* 40 (1985), pp. 92–106.

the 5 faculties (*pañcendriyāni*);  
 the 5 powers (*pañcabalāni*);  
 the 7 factors of awakening (*satta bojjhaṅgā*);  
 the noble eightfold path (*ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*).

The same list is given in the Pyu script of Śrīkṣetra on one of the gold plates from “Khin Ba’s Mound” at Hmawza in Prome District, Burma.<sup>7</sup> The only difference is that the present inscription concludes with the general title “37 factors conducive to enlightenment” (*sattatiṅsa bodhipakkhiyadhammā*), not given in the Pyu version.

C) Side C gives a single verse:

I have realized what is to be realized;  
 I have cultivated what is to be cultivated;  
 I have abandoned what is to be abandoned;  
 therefore, O brāhmaṇa, I am a Buddha.

The verse, spoken by the Buddha to the brāhmaṇa Sela, occurs in the *Sela-sutta* of the *Mahāvagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta* (v. 558) and in the verses of the Elder Sela in the *Viṣati-nipāta* of the *Theragāthā* (v. 828). It also occurs in the *Brahmāyu-sutta* in the *Brāhmaṇa-vagga* of the *Majjhima-nikāya* (sutta 91, Vol. II 143.29), spoken by the Buddha to the brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu. Buddhaghosa (5th century) cites the verse for the definition of *sambuddha* in his *Visuddhimagga*.<sup>8</sup> A partial Lokottaravādin counterpart occurs (in a corrupt state?) in the *Mahāvastu*, spoken to the Ājīvaka Upaka by the Buddha shortly after his

<sup>7</sup> U Tha Myat, *Pyu Reader*, Rangoon, 1963, Pl. VI 1–3, pp. 26, 30.

<sup>8</sup> Henry Clarke Warren (ed.), Dharmaranda Kosambi (rev.), *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya* (Harvard Oriental Series 41) [Cambridge, Mass., 1950] Delhi, 1989, p. 166.11.

124/7

enlightenment.<sup>9</sup> Mūlasarvāstivādin parallels occur in the *Verses of Kaineya* in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Vinaya* of that school, as preserved in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation,<sup>10</sup> and in a short sūtra preserved in Tibetan translation in Śamathadeva’s precious commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*.<sup>11</sup> The latter has close parallels in the *Tsa a han ching* (the “longer” Chinese *Samyuktāgama*, translated by Guṇabhadra between 435–43)<sup>12</sup> and in the *Pieh i tsa a han ching* (the “shorter” Chinese *Samyuktāgama*, an anonymous translation done during the Three Ch’in dynasties, 352–431).<sup>13</sup> Bhavya (6th century) refers to the verse in his *Madhyamakahrdaya-kārikās* for the first of three definitions of the word “Buddha”,<sup>14</sup> and cites it in his commentary thereon, the *Tarkajvālā*,<sup>15</sup> as

<sup>9</sup> *Mahāvastu* III 327,2 n. 9.

<sup>10</sup> *Kaineya-gāthā*, in Nalinaksha Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III–1, [Srinagar, 1947] Delhi, 1984, p. 268.19; *Ke na’i bu’i tshigs su bcad pa, sMan gyi gzi*, Peking Tibetan *Tripitaka* § 1030, Vol. 41, ‘dul ba ṅa, 218b4. The relationship between the *Kaineya-gāthā* and the better known *Śaila-gāthā*—frequently mentioned in (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin literature—or *Sela-sutta*, which share a number of verses, remains to be determined (cp. *Bhaiṣajyavastu* 275.4–12 with *Sutta-nipāta* vv. 549–54 and *Bhaiṣajyavastu* 277, penult–278, ult with *Sutta-nipāta* vv. 559–64).

<sup>11</sup> *Upāyikā Tikā* on the *Abhidharmakośa*, Peking Tibetan *Tripitaka* § 5595, Vol. 118, *mñon pa tu*, 2b6.

<sup>12</sup> Taishō 99, no. 100 (Vol. 2, 28a); see Lewis R. Lancaster in collaboration with Sung-bae Park, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*, Berkeley, 1979, § 650, Ch. (4) 13.

<sup>13</sup> Taishō 100, no. 266 (Vol. 2, 467a); *Korean Buddhist Canon* § 651, No. 13.17. I am grateful to J.-U. Hartmann (Berlin) for checking the Chinese sources.

<sup>14</sup> Ch. 3, v. 268; see Malcom David Eckel, *To See the Buddha: a Philosopher’s Quest for the Meaning of Emptiness*, San Francisco, 1992, p. 159 and p. 224, n. 10.

<sup>15</sup> Translated in Eckel, *loc. cit.*



125/7

well as in his *Prajñāpradīpa*<sup>16</sup> and *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*.<sup>17</sup> Kamalaśīla (circa 740–95) also cites the verse, with variants, in his *Pañjikā* on Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṃgraha*.<sup>18</sup>

The verse is known from another inscription from Ban Phrom Din, Tambon Lum Khao, Amphoe Khok Samrong, Lop Buri, published with photographs in *Ancient Inscriptions from the Early Period Found in Lop Buri and Vicinity* and in *Inscriptions of Thailand*, Vol. I.<sup>19</sup> The inscription, found by a farmer while ploughing his fields, is in a somewhat cursive and less ornate Pallava, but otherwise the form of the characters is close to that of the present inscription. The editors of the former work date it to the 14th century BE, those of the latter to the 13th to 14th centuries: that is, from about 650 to 850 CE. In both inscriptions the -vv- in place of the -bb- of “standard” Pāli is quite clear: in *bhāvetavvaṃ* and *pahātavvaṃ* in the Nakhon Chaisi inscription, and in *pahātavvaṃ* in the Phrom Din inscription, which is fragmentary. That *va* and *ba* were distinguished in “Dvāravatī Pallava” may be easily seen by

<sup>16</sup> See Christian Lindtner, “Materials for the Study of Bhavya”, in Eivind Kahrs (ed.), *Kalyānamitrārāgaṇam: Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, Oslo, 1986, n. 23, p. 191.

<sup>17</sup> Translated by Lindtner, *op. cit.*, p. 188. While Bhavya's authorship of the *Prajñāpradīpa* is not questioned, it is for the other two works. For this problem, see David Seyfort Ruegg, “On the Authorship of Some Works Ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya”, in David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen (ed.), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaṅga*, Leiden, 1990, pp. 59–71, and also Eckel, p. 197, n. 1.

<sup>18</sup> Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Shāntarakṣita with the Commentary 'Pañjikā' of Shri Kamalashīla* (Bauddha Bharati Series 2), Vol. 2, Varanasi, 1982, p. 1121.¶1. Cf. the translation in Ganganatha Jha, *The Tattvasaṅgraha of Shāntarakṣita with the Commentary of Kamalashīla*, Vol. II, [Baroda, 1939] Delhi, 1986, p. 1567.

<sup>19</sup> *Charuk boran run raek phop ti lop buri lae klai khiang*, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2524 [1981], pp. 14–17; *Charuk nai prathet thai*, Vol. I, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], pp. 237–40.

comparing the shape of the *va* with that of the *ba* in *buddha* in both inscriptions, and in several other places in the present inscription. Oskar von Hinüber has already noted the same peculiarity in a *dhammacakka* inscription from Nakhon Pathom—which carries the readings *pahātavvaṃ*, *sacchikātavvaṃ*, and *bhāvetavvaṃ*—as well as in a later inscription from Lamphun.<sup>20</sup> The form also occurs in *veditavvo* in the “Maunggun plates” from near Hmawza in Burma.<sup>21</sup> These texts offer further evidence for von Hinüber's suggestion that “it does not seem to be altogether impossible that the Pāli of Dvāravatī differed in this respect [that is, using -vv- for -bb-] at least from standard Ceylonese Pāli”.

D) Side D contains two verses, one to each line. The first summarizes the four truths:

Suffering, the arising of suffering,  
the transcendence of suffering,  
and the noble eightfold path  
that leads to the cessation of suffering.

The verse occurs frequently in Pāli: in the *Dhammapada* (v. 191), *Samyutta-nikāya* (II 185.23), *Itivuttaka* (17.22–18.2), *Theragāthā*

<sup>20</sup> “Epigraphical Varieties”, p. 186, referring to G. Coedès, “Une roue de la loi avec inscription en pāli provenant du site de P'ra Pathom”, in *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1966) pp. 221–26. The inscription has been published in *Charuk nai prathet thai*, Vol. I, pp. 59–64. The inscribed *dhammacakka* from Manorom district, Chai Nat, studied in Part II below has the form *sacchikātabba*, as read in *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao* (Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2534 [1991], p. 180): this should be checked against the original. A Pāli *Vinaya* manuscript from Nepal has the form *ñāpetavvo*: see Oskar von Hinüber, *The Oldest Pāli Manuscript: Four Folios of the Vinaya-Piṭaka from the National Archives*, Kathmandu, Stuttgart, 1991, p. 9.

<sup>21</sup> Louis Finot, “Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme birman”, *Journal asiatique*, dixième série, tome XX (1912), p. 131.

(v. 1259), and *Therīgāthā* (vv. 186, 193, 310, 321). It occurs in Sanskrit in (Mūla)Sārvāstivādin literature: in the *Paśyavarga* of the *Udānavarga*, and, with variants, in the *Vidyāsthānopama-sūtra* and the *Prātihārya-sūtra* (of the *Divyāvādāna*); it is cited in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the *Vibhāṣāprabhā-vṛtti* on the *Abhidharma-dīpa*, and other treatises. In Tibetan translation it occurs in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasārvāstivādins and in the *Dhvajāgra-sūtra* of the same school.<sup>22</sup> In the *Āryamaitreya-vyākaraṇa* it is presented as the epitome of Maitreya's teaching:<sup>23</sup> thus it is a formula summarizing the teaching of the Buddhas. In a Sogdian eulogy dedicated to Avalokiteśvara it seems to have been used as a mantra.<sup>24</sup> The verse occurs three times in inscriptions: in a slightly Sanskritized Pāli from Guntupalle in Andhra Pradesh, and in Pāli from U Thong (Suphan Buri province) and in the present inscription from Nakhon Pathom.<sup>25</sup>

The subject of the second verse is the Buddha:

Thus the Buddha, having realized [the truth]  
taught the Dhamma to the monks;  
the Teacher, who has put an end to suffering,  
the one with vision, has realized full nibbāna.

<sup>22</sup> For references see Skilling, "A Buddhist Verse Inscription", pp. 240–41. For the *Dhvajāgra-sūtra* version see P. Skilling, *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1994, pp. 306–7. The verse is discussed in further details in Vol. II of the same work (forthcoming).

<sup>23</sup> Nalinaksha Dutt (ed.), *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. IV, [Calcutta, 1959] Delhi, 1984, vv. 58cd–59ab (p. 203); Sylvain Lévi, "Maitreya le consolateur", in *Études d'orientalisme publiées par le Musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, tome II, Paris, 1932, v. 60 (p. 387). I owe this reference to Gregory Schopen, "Hīnayāna Texts in a 14th Century Persian Chronicle: Notes on Some of Rashid al-Dīn's Sources", *Central Asiatic Journal* 26 (1982), pp. 228–35.

<sup>24</sup> E. Benveniste, *Textes Sogdiens édités, traduits et commentés* (Mission Pelliot en Asie centrale III, Paris, 1940, p. 113.

<sup>25</sup> For the first two see Skilling, "A Buddhist Verse Inscription".

The verse occurs once in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (*Dīghanikāya* II 123.9) and twice in the *Ānguttara-nikāya* (II 2.3, IV 106.5). In all three cases it is spoken by the Buddha, following the verse:

Virtue, concentration, wisdom,  
and the unsurpassed liberation:  
these dhammas have been realized  
by Gotama, the illustrious.<sup>26</sup>

This is the first time that the verse has been noted in an inscription. The *itī* ("thus") with which it commences should refer to the preceding verse on the four Truths; thus the two verses of Side D seem to have been connected in the Dvāravatī tradition.

### 3. Conclusions

The present inscription is one of the most complete of the Dvāravatī *corpus*, which is made up of mostly fragmentary texts. It is a significant addition to our knowledge of the Buddhism of the Dvāravatī period. The language of the texts (with the exception of the opening Sanskrit *śrī*) is Pāli. The orthography (with the exception of the *-v-* / *-bb-* discrepancy) agrees with that of the Pāli texts transmitted in Ceylon: indeed the verses of the inscription could have been taken from a modern printed edition of the canon, with scarcely a single variant.

The inscription confirms the preoccupation of the Dvāravatī Buddhists with what the exhibition catalogue has called "the essence of the Buddha's teaching". The four truths are given twice, in the bare list of A and in the verse of D. Dependent arising is given in A; it is also given

<sup>26</sup> *silam samādhi paññā ca vimutti ca anuttarā, anubuddhā ime dhammā gotamena yasassinā.*

127/7

in fuller form on at least one *dharmacakka*, and is represented by the numerous *ye dhammā* inscriptions from various sites. The Pyu of Śrīkṣetra also inscribed canonical texts on various materials, sometimes the same ones inscribed in Dvāravati: dependent arising, the *ye dhammā* verse, and the 37 factors.<sup>27</sup> While such a practice is well attested in Burma and Siam, no contemporary canonical Pāli inscriptions have been found in Ceylon, where extensive excavations have taken place for over a century. It is astonishing that an article published in 1971 could list only three Pāli inscriptions for the whole of Ceylon, all later than those of Dvāravati or Śrīkṣetra.<sup>28</sup> Examples of canonical inscriptions from South India are rare: I know of only the interesting trove of distinctive sealings in Pallava script from the Śāṅkaram Hills in Andhra Pradesh,<sup>29</sup> and the verse from Andhra mentioned above. Throughout Northern India the practice of inscribing the *ye dharmā* verse and the *Discourse on Dependent Arising*, whether in Sanskrit or Prakrit, was widespread from at least the early Gupta period. This suggests that the early Buddhism of Burma and Siam had links with Northern India—the heartland of Magadha—which is only natural since such links may be seen throughout the historical period up to the present. On the basis of available evidence, the predominant school at both Dvāravati and Śrīkṣetra seems to have been a form of Theravāda affiliated to that of

<sup>27</sup> For canonical citations from Burma, see Nihar-ranjan Ray, "Early Traces of Buddhism in Burma", *The Journal of the Greater India Society*, Vol. VI-1 (January, 1939), pp. 41-49, and G.H. Luce, "The Advent of Buddhism to Burma", in L. Cousins et al. (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht and Boston, 1974, pp. 125-127.

<sup>28</sup> Malini Dias, "Sanskrit and Pāli Inscriptions of Ceylon", in *Ancient Ceylon*, No. 1, January 1971, pp. 105-109.

<sup>29</sup> See A. Rea, "A Buddhist Monastery on the Śāṅkaram Hills, Vizagapatam District", *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1907-8*, repr. Delhi, 1990, pp. 149-80 (especially pp. 169-72) and Pls. LVIII-LX. The inscriptions that I am able to decipher from the rather murky reprint give the *ye dharmā* verse in Sanskrit.

India—whether of the North, of Andhra Pradesh, or several regions together—as well as to that of Ceylon. The early Buddhism of South-east Asia should not, however, be seen as a simple import. By the time of the inscriptions it had already adapted to local social and cultural conditions, and evolved its own characteristics.

## II. PĀLI INSCRIPTIONS ON A STONE *DHAMMACAKKA* AND AN OCTAGONAL PILLAR FROM CHAI NAT\*

Among the interesting inscriptions unearthed in Siam in recent years are some fragments in Pāli, inscribed in the South-east Asian Pallava script on a stone *dharmacakka* or "wheel of the law" and on an octagonal stone pillar, which originally supported the wheel. The fragments were discovered at Tambon Hang Nam Sakhon, Amphoe Manorom, Chai Nat (Jayanāda) Province, on 5th October, 2531 [1988]. The inscription has been published in a Fine Arts Department report entitled *The Archaeology of U Taphao*.<sup>1</sup> Its paleography has been discussed by Christian Bauer in his "Notes on Mon Epigraphy" (accompanied by four plates, without transcription).<sup>2</sup> The Fine Arts Department dates the inscription to the 12th century BE (*circa* 550-650

\* References to Pāli texts are to roman script editions of the Pali Text Society (PTS); to Thai-script editions of the Syāmrattḥassa Tepitakam (SyR) or those published by the Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya (Mm); to Burmese script Chatḥhasaṅgiti editions (ChS); or to Nāgari script Nālandā editions (Nāl), as available.

<sup>1</sup> *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao*, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2534 [1991]. A transcription and Thai translation of the fragments by Cha-ame Kaewglai is given in an Appendix, pp. 179-82, an English summary of the book at pp. 183-93. For two photographs of the *dharmacakra* and one of the pillar, see (the unnumbered) pp. 32, 33. Cf. also *The Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (1991), pp. 4-50.

<sup>2</sup> "Notes on Mon Epigraphy", *Journal of the Siam Society* 79/1 (1991), Pls. 1-4 and pp. 48-55.

CE), while Bauer concludes that it is possible "to date this *dharmacakra* with certainty to the 6th century AD".<sup>3</sup>

The surviving fragments of the wheel, which is carved in the round, are inscribed on both rim and spokes. Associated finds include fragments of an ear and the nose and mouth of a stone deer.<sup>4</sup> Pairs of recumbent deer, symbolizing the Deer Park where the Buddha delivered the First Sermon, have been found in association with *dharmacakkas* elsewhere in Central Siam. The motif of a wheel flanked by a pair of deer is known from sculpture and monastic sealings from Northern India, and frequently adorns the roof-tops of Tibetan temples up to the present day.

I give here a romanized version of Cha-ame Kaewglai's Thai script transcription.<sup>5</sup> The sequence is that of Cha-ame's restored text; the numbers in square brackets are those assigned to fragments or groups of fragments by the Fine Arts Department. In No. 1.a, text in square brackets is supplied from the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*; in Nos. 1.b and 2, the symbol "xxx" indicates missing text.

### 1. *Dhammacakka* inscriptions

#### 1.a. Rim of the wheel: *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*

[6] [pu]bbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi

[5] dukkham ariyasaccam pariññeyyan ti me bhikkhave [pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu] cakkhum [udapādi nāṇam udapādi] paññā udapādi vijjā udapādi

<sup>3</sup> Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Illustrated in *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao*, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately a complete set of photographs of the inscriptions has not been published, and only a few of those mentioned above are readable.

[1] [ā]loko udapādi // [taṃ kho panidaṃ dukkhaṃ ariyasaccam] pariññātan ti me bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi nāṇam udapādi paññā udapādi vijjā udapādi āloko udapādi // idaṃ dukkhasamudayo ariya[saccan ti me bhikkhave...]

[3] paññā udapādi vijjā udapādi āloko udapādi // taṃ kho panidaṃ dukkhanirodho ariya[saccam...]

[2] [sa]cchikātabban ti me bhikkhave pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi<sup>6</sup> nāṇam udapādi paññā udapādi vijjā udapādi āloko udapādi<sup>7</sup> // [taṃ kho panidaṃ dukkhanirodho ariyasaccam] sacchikatan ti me bhikkhave pu-

[4] -bbe ananussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi nāṇam udapādi paññā udapādi vijjā udapādi [āloko udapādi]

#### 1.b. Spokes: Commentary on the Four Truths?

[8]<sup>8</sup>

(1) na

(2) tti

(3) pilana

(4) samudayasa<sup>9</sup>

(5) dhipateyya<sup>10</sup>

(6) sa xxx /

(7) xxx

(8) xxx

<sup>6</sup> *dudapādi*, Cha-ame.

<sup>7</sup> *dudapādi*, Cha-ame.

<sup>8</sup> The numbers in parentheses are those assigned to individual spokes.

<sup>9</sup> See the upper spoke in Bauer, Pl. 3.

<sup>10</sup> See the lower spoke in Bauer, Pl. 3.

[9]

- (1) dhi  
 (2) samudayasa

## 2. Inscription on octagonal pillar: Verses<sup>11</sup>

- [7] (1) xxx  
 (2) xxx tato xxx dimaṭa<sup>12</sup> // tobā<sup>13</sup> xxx  
 (3) xxx mena iti saccaṃ visattikā taṃ xxx  
 (4) xxx mena tato saccaṃ idaṃ matam / / xxx  
 (5) xxx iti so<sup>14</sup> saccasam<sup>15</sup> xxx

### Discussion

1.a) Fragments 1 to 6 belong to the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, the first sermon spoken by the Buddha to the Group of Five Monks at the Deer Park (Migadāya) at Isipatana in Vārāṇasī.<sup>16</sup> The surviving portions all belong to the section on the Buddha's realization of the three insights (*sacca-*, *kiicca-*, *kata-ñāṇam*) into the first three Truths of the Noble Ones (*ariya-sacca*).<sup>17</sup> Since the fourth Truth must have been included, we may

<sup>11</sup> Most of the pillar text can be read from the plate at *Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao*, p. 33, and Bauer, Pl. 4. The numbers in parentheses are those of the lines, after Bauer.

<sup>12</sup> From Bauer's plate it appears that Cha-ame's reading may be corrected to (*i*)*da(m) matam*, as in the texts (the "texts" will be described and cited below).

<sup>13</sup> *tobā* cannot be right: the texts have here *taṃ vinā*.

<sup>14</sup> Cha-ame reads *sā*, but the reading is clearly *so*, as in the texts.

<sup>15</sup> The last word might be *samato*: only a single *ma* is visible, followed by what might be the left-hand curve of an *o*.

<sup>16</sup> *Samyuttanikāya*, *Mahāvagga*, *Saccasamyutta*, *Dhammacakkappavattana-vagga*, 1.

<sup>17</sup> SN (PTS) V 422.2–22; (SyR) Vol. 19, 529.11–530.10. The same text occurs

121/7

conclude that the rim of the wheel gave at least the complete text of the realization of the three insights into each of the Four Truths.

As transcribed, the text presents two orthographical peculiarities:

*ariyya* in Frags. [5], [1], and [3];

*paṇṇā* in Frags. [1], [3], [2], and [4] (but *pañṇā* in Frag. [5]).

We may also note that the text has *dukkhasamudayo* in Frag. [1] and *dukkhanirodho* in Frag. [3], which agree with the readings of SyR (both SN and *Vinaya*), against the *dukkhasamudayaṃ* and *dukkhanirodham* of PTS (both SN and *Vinaya*).<sup>18</sup>

1.b) The fragmentary condition of the inscriptions prevents a precise identification. The presence (twice) of the word *samudayasa* on a *dhammacakka* inscribed with the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta* leaves little doubt that the subject is again the Four Truths. The two other preserved words, *pilana* and *[ā]dhipateyya*, do not occur in connection with the Four Truths in the early sutta literature. The citation might therefore belong to the later commentarial literature, which assigns four meanings to each of the Four Truths, and includes the two terms:<sup>19</sup>

in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Vinaya*: (PTS) I 11.1–14; (SyR) Vol. 4, 19.10–20.16. Almost the same text occurs as an independent sutta, *Tathāgatena vuttam*, at SN V (PTS) 424–25, (SyR) 532–34, with the substitution of *tathāgatānam* for *me*.

<sup>18</sup> The question of case endings of the Four Truths has been discussed in detail by K.R. Norman, "The Four Noble Truths: A Problem of Pāli Syntax", in L.A. Hercus *et al.* (ed.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, 2nd. ed., Delhi, 1984, pp. 377–91 (see especially § 1.5) (= *Collected Papers* Vol. II, PTS, Oxford 1991).

<sup>19</sup> Here and in the following citations I underline the terms that occur in the Chai Nat inscription.

- A. *dukkha*: (1) *pīlana*, (2) *saṃkhata*, (3) *santāpa*, (4) *vipariṇāma*;  
 B. *saṃudaya*: (5) *āyuhana*, (6) *nidāna*, (7) *saññoga*, (8) *palibodha*;  
 C. *nirodha*: (9) *nissaraṇa*, (10) *viveka*, (11) *asaṃkhata*, (12) *amata*;  
 D. *maggā*: (13) *niyyāna*, (14) *hetu*, (15) *dassana*, (16) *ādhipateyya*.

A concise statement of this theory is found near the end of the *Buddhānussatikathā* of the *Visuddhimagga*.<sup>20</sup>

*pīlana-saṃkhata-santāpa-vipariṇāmatthēna vā dukkhaṃ ariya-saccam; āyuhana-nidāna-samyoga-palibodhatthēna saṃudayaṃ; nissaraṇa-vivekāsaṃkhata-amataṃ nirodham; niyyānika-hetu-dassanādhipateyyatthēna maggaṃ.*

The Truth of the Noble Ones regarding suffering has the senses of (1) oppressing, (2) being compounded, (3) burning, and (4) change. Origin has the senses of (5) accumulating, (6) source, (7) bond, and (8) obstructing. Cessation has the senses of (9) final release, (10) solitude, (11) being un-compounded, and (12) being free from death. The path has the senses of (13) outlet, (14) cause, (15) seeing, and (16) predominance.

The four senses of the Truth of the Path (*maggasacca*) are preserved in another inscription, on a *dhammacakka* from Nakhon Pathom dated to the 6th or 7th century: *niyyānikahetudassanādhipateyyabhāvena maggasacce*.<sup>21</sup> The phrasing is close but not identical to that of the *Visuddhimagga*.

<sup>20</sup> Chap. VII.62; (Mm) I 271.2–5.

<sup>21</sup> Bauer, *op. cit.*, Fig. F, no. Kd.24 (for which read Kd.29; for Coedès 1956 read Coedès 1966) gives 6th century; *Charuk nai prathet thai* (hereafter referred to as *Charuk*), Vol. I, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], p. 59 gives 12th century BE = circa 550–650 CE. See also Supaphan na

*Continues...*

The 16 meanings (*aṭṭha*) are different from the 16 aspects (*ākāra*) of the Four Truths, well-known in the Vaibhāsika tradition, and are apparently unique to Theravādin exegesis.<sup>22</sup> The earliest evidence of the Theravādin theory is in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, where the terms occur several times.<sup>23</sup> The first occurrence is early in the text, in the “Discussion of Insight” of the *Mahāvagga*:<sup>24</sup>

Bangchang, *Wiwathanakan ngan khian phasa bali nai prathet thai: charuk tamnan phongsawadan san pratat*, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], pp. 34–36; G. Coedès, “Une roue de la loi avec inscription en pāli provenant du site de P’ra Pathom”, *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1966), pp. 222, 225.

<sup>22</sup> For the 16 aspects according to the Vaibhāsikas see e.g. Valentina Stache-Rosen (ed., tr.), *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im Älteren Buddhismus II. Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya*, Part I, Berlin, 1968, IV.14 (p. 100); I. Armelin (tr.), *Le coeur de la loi suprême, Traité de Fa-cheng, Abhidharmahrdayasāstra de Dharmasrī*, Paris, 1978, p. 116; José Van den Broeck (tr.), *La saveur de l’immortel (A-p’i-t’an Kan Lu Wei Lun), la version chinoise de l’Amṛtarasa de Ghoṣaka (T. 1553)*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1977, p. 170; Marcel Van Velthem (ed., tr.) *Le traité de la descente dans la profonde loi (Abhidharmāvatārasāstra) de l’Arhat Skandhila*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1977, pp. 48 (translation), 98.5–16 (text); *Sārasamuccaya-nāma-abhidharmāvatāra-ṭīkā*, Peking Tanjur No. 5598, Vol. 119, *mñon pa thu*, 359b8 foll.; N. Aiyaswami Sastri, *Pañcavastuka Śāstra and Pañcavastuka-vibhāṣā*, Santiniketan, n.d., p. 10; *Abhidharmakośa* VII, 13a; Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, tome V, Brussels, 1971, pp. 30–39; Padmanabh S. Jaini (ed.), *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, Patna, 1977, pp. 329–30; Chr. Lindtner (ed.), “Candrakīrti’s Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa, I. Tibetan Text”, *Acta Orientalia* XL (1979), pp. 140–41.

<sup>23</sup> Although the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* is included in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* of the Pāli Canon, it is stylistically related to the Abhidhamma and Commentarial literature: see A.K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi, 1970, pp. 312–16; A.K. Warder, Introduction to Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli (tr.), *The Path of Discrimination*, London, 1982; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 87–89. Tradition ascribes the work to Sāriputta. Warder’s assertion (Introduction to Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, p. xivi, repeated almost *verbatim* in Norman, *Pāli Literature*, p. 132) that “Mahānāma begins [his commentary, the *Saddhammapakāsinī*] by saying that Sāriputta explained the *Dhammacakkappavattana Suttanta* by

*Continues...*

- A. *dukkhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa pīlanatṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa samkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo*<sup>25</sup> *dukkhassa santāpaṭṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa vipariṇāmatṭho abhiññeyyo.*
- B. *samudayaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa āyuhanaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa nidānaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa saññogaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa palibodhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo.*
- C. *nirodhaṭṭho*<sup>26</sup> *abhiññeyyo nirodhassa nissaraṇaṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhassa vivekaṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhassa asaṅkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhassa amataṭṭho abhiññeyyo.*
- D. *maggatṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa niyyānaṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa hetuṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa dassanaṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa ādhipateyyatṭho abhiññeyyo.*

A longer passage occurs in the “Discussion of the Truths” in the “Chapter on Pairs”:<sup>27</sup>

composing the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*” is incorrect. The text reads (Mm I 2.4):  
*saddhammacakkānupavattakena saddhammasenāpatisāvakena  
 suttesu vuttesu tathāgatena bhūtatthavedittam upāgatena  
 yo bhāsito bhāsitaṅkovidena dhammappadīpujjalanāyakena  
 pātho visiṭṭho paṭisambhidānaṃ maggo ti...*

The verses refer to the author, Sāriputta, by several of his epithets—the one who turns the *dhammacakka* after the Buddha (*saddhammacakkānupavattake*: cf. *Suttanipāta* 556–57 = *Theragāthā* 826–27), the Dhamma-general (*saddhammasenāpati*: cf. *Theragāthā* 1083)—but say nothing about the *Dhammacakkapavattana-sutta*.

<sup>24</sup> *Nānakathā*, (PTS) I 19.31–20.6; (SyR) 28.10–20; translation pp. 21–22. For a commentary see *Saddhammapakāsini nāma paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā*, (Mm, BE 2465 [= CE 1922]) I 123.14–124.4.

<sup>25</sup> SyR : PTS omits *dukkhassa samkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo*.

<sup>26</sup> *nirodhaṭṭho* SyR : *nirodho* PTS.

- A. *kathaṃ dukkhaṃ tathaṭṭhena saccam? cattāro dukkhassa dukkhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: dukkhassa pīlanatṭho saṅkhataṭṭho santāpaṭṭho vipariṇāmatṭho. ime cattāro dukkhassa dukkhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā; evaṃ dukkhaṃ tathaṭṭhena saccam.*
- B. *kathaṃ samudayo tathaṭṭhena saccam? cattāro samudayassa samudayaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: samudayassa āyuhanaṭṭho nidānaṭṭho saññogaṭṭho palibodhaṭṭho. ime cattāro samudayassa samudayaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā; evaṃ samudayo tathaṭṭhena saccam.*
- C. *kathaṃ nirodho tathaṭṭhena saccam? cattāro nirodhassa nirodhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: nirodhassa nissaraṇaṭṭho vivekaṭṭho asaṅkhataṭṭho amataṭṭho. ime cattāro nirodhassa nirodhaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā; evaṃ nirodho tathaṭṭhena saccam.*
- D. *kathaṃ maggo tathaṭṭhena saccam? cattāro maggassa maggaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā: maggassa niyyānaṭṭho hetuṭṭho dassanaṭṭho ādhipateyyatṭho. ime cattāro maggassa maggaṭṭhā tathā avitathā anaññathā; evaṃ maggo tathaṭṭhena saccam.*

The next evidence for the theory is from the *Vimuttimaggā*, a manual transmitted by the Abhayagiri school in Ceylon and abroad. The work was composed by Upatissa, in perhaps the 1st century CE, and

<sup>27</sup> *Paṭisambhidāmagga, Yuganaddhavagga, Saccakathā*, (PTS) II 104.14–105.10; (SyR) Vol. 31, 449.5–20; translation p. 297. The passage is cited in abbreviation under *vibhāga* in the *Saccaniddesa* of the *Visuddhimaggā* (Chap. XVI.15, Mm III 76.18–77.4) and in the *Saccavibhaṅga* of the *Sammohavinodanī nāma vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā*, (ChS 78.14–19; Nāl 84.12–17).

certainly before the time of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th century).<sup>28</sup> The original Pāli is lost, but the complete text survives in Chinese translation, done by \*Samghabhara, a *bhikkhu* of Funan (an early state in the region of southern mainland South-east Asia), at the beginning of the 6th century.<sup>29</sup> The section in question is also preserved in Tibetan translation, as cited by the North Indian scholar Daśabalaśrīmitra in his *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*, composed in the 12th or 13th century.<sup>30</sup> It deals with the Four Truths under the heading “natures” or “characteristics” (*mtshan ñid = lakkhana*).

(Tibetan text)<sup>31</sup>

*mtshan ñid zes pa ni* (a) *sdug bsnal ni ñes pa'i mtshan ñid dan'*  
 (b) *kun 'byuñ ni rgyu'i mtshan ñid dan'* (c) *'gog pa ni mi skye ba'i mtshan ñid dan'* (d) *lam ni*<sup>32</sup> *thabs kyi mtshan ñid do//*  
*yañ na*<sup>33</sup> *sdug bsnal ni* (1) *gzir ba'i mtshan ñid dan'* (2) *kun du*<sup>34</sup> *gduñ ba'i mtshan ñid dan'* (3) *'dus byas kyi mtshan ñid dan'* (4) *yoñs su 'gyur ba'i mtshan ñid do// kun 'byuñ ni* (5) *'phen par byed pa'i mtshan ñid dan'* (6) *gzi'i*<sup>35</sup> *mtshan ñid dan'*

<sup>28</sup> Norman, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

<sup>29</sup> For the affiliation of the *Vimuttimaggā* and the name and date of the translator, see P. Skilling, “*Vimuttimaggā* and Abhayagiri: The Form-aggregate according to the *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya*”, *JPTS* XX (1994) 171–210.

<sup>30</sup> For Daśabalaśrīmitra see P. Skilling, “The *Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya* of Daśabalaśrīmitra”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, 4/1 (1987), pp. 3–23, and “Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation”, *JPTS* XIX (1993), pp. 140–42.

<sup>31</sup> Daśabalaśrīmitra (sTobs bcu dpal bśes gñen), *Dus byas dan' dus ma byas rnam par ñes pa*, Derge Tanjur (D) No. 3897, *dbu ma ha*, 192b4–7; Peking Tanjur (Q) No. 5865, Vol. 146, *no mtshar ño*, 109a6–b2.

<sup>32</sup> *ni* D: Q omits.

<sup>33</sup> /D: Q omits.

<sup>34</sup> *kun du* D: *kun tu* Q.

<sup>35</sup> *gzi'i* Q: *bzi'i* D.

(7) *kun du tshogs*<sup>36</sup> *pa'i mtshan ñid dan'* (8) *yoñs su sbags pa'i mtshan ñid do// 'gog pa ni* (9) *ñes far 'byuñ ba'i mtshan ñid dan'*<sup>37</sup> (10) *dben pa'i mtshan ñid dan'* (11) *'dus ma byas kyi mtshan ñid dan'* (12) *mi 'chi ba'i mtshan ñid do// lam ni* (13) *ñes par 'byin par byed pa'i mtshan ñid dan'* (14) *yañ dag par thob par byed pa'i mtshan ñid dan'* (15) *mthoñ ba'i mtshan ñid dan'* (16) *lhag pa'i bdag po'i mtshan ñid do//*

(Translation from the Tibetan)<sup>38</sup>

“Natures” (*lakkhana*): (a) suffering (*dukkha*) has the nature of fault (*dosa*). (b) Origin (*samudaya*) has the nature of cause (*hetu*). (c) Cessation (*nirodha*) has the nature of non-birth (*anuppatti?*). (d) Path (*magga*) has the nature of method (*upāya*).<sup>39</sup>

Furthermore, suffering has (1) the nature of oppressing (*piḷana*),<sup>40</sup> (2) the nature of burning (*santāpa*), (3) the nature of being compounded (*saṃkhata*), and (4) the nature of change (*vipariṇāma*). Origin has (5) the nature of projecting,<sup>41</sup> (6) the

<sup>36</sup> *kun du tshogs* D: *kun tu 'tshogs* Q.

<sup>37</sup> *dan'* D: *do//* Q.

<sup>38</sup> The Pāli terms given in parentheses are equivalents of standard Sanskrit equivalents of the Tibetan; references are to Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Compact edition, Kyoto, 1990 (*TSD*). Nos. 1–4, 6, 9–13, and 15–16 agree with the Pāli. The order of nos. 2 and 3 is opposite to that of the Pāli. The remaining items are discussed in the notes.

<sup>39</sup> I have not traced an exact Pāli parallel to (a)–(d), which agrees with the Chinese.

<sup>40</sup> *gzir ba = PīD: piḍita, paripiḍita, prapiḍita*, also *ardita, ātura, ārita*: *TSD* pp. 2083–84.

<sup>41</sup> *'phen pa* is regularly used for the root *KṣIP*; *byed pa = karaṇa*. Cf. *TSD* pp. 1592–93: *'phen pa = ākṣepa, ākṣepaṇa, āvedha, preraka*. The term may be interpreted to mean that *tanhā* projects further existence and rebirth. I cannot



nature of source (*nidāna*), (7) the nature of accumulating,<sup>42</sup> and (8) the nature of defiling.<sup>43</sup> Cessation has (9) the nature of final release (*nissaraṇa*), (10) the nature of solitude (*viveka*), (11) the nature of being un compounded (*asaṃkhata*), and (12) the nature of freedom from death (*amata*). The path has (13) the nature of outlet (*niyyāna*), (14) the nature of achieving,<sup>44</sup> (15) the nature of seeing (*dassana*), and (16) the nature of predominance (*ādhipateyya*).<sup>45</sup>

suggest a Pāli equivalent.

<sup>42</sup> The Pāli has here *saṃ-yoga*. The Tibetan *kun tu* = *saṃ*; it is possible that here *tshogs* (= accumulation, collection, group) = *yoga*, although such a translation is not attested. *kun tu tshogs pa* = *samāgatā* (TSD p. 24). Cf. Akira Hirakawa *et al.*, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Part 1, Tokyo, 1973, p. 362, *saṃyoga* = *mtshuṅs par ldan pa*, *phrad pa*, *'brel ba*, *reg pa*. The term may be interpreted to mean that *taṅhā* accumulates suffering; in fact, in the present context, this seems a more suitable interpretation of *saṃyoga* than the sense of "bond" = *saññojana*, though both are possible.

<sup>43</sup> The Pāli has here *palibodha* = "obstruction, hindrance, obstacle, impediment, drawback" (*PED*), a term which does not seem to be known in Buddhist Sanskrit. The Tibetan *yoṅs su* = *pari. sbags*, a rather rare term in translation literature, does not carry the sense "obstruct", but rather to saturate, dampen, besmear, stain, pollute: cf. TSD p. 1742, *khrag gis sbags* = *rudhira-mrakṣita*; *khrag sbags śin* = *rudhiralipta*; Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, Supplementary Volume 5* (New Delhi, 1993, p. 1349) *sbags (pa)* = *akta*, *ādigdha*, *ārdrā*, *sikta*; Hirakawa *et al.*, p. 300, *mrakṣa* = *sbags*. Derge appears to read *spags*, but I believe that *sbags* is the correct reading. I cannot suggest a possible Pāli equivalent.

<sup>44</sup> Here the Tibetan is certainly different from the Pāli, which has *hetu* (a term regularly rendered in Tibetan as *rgyu*). The Tibetan *yan dag par* = *saṃ*; *thob pa* = *PRĀP*; *byed pa* = *karaṇa*. Equivalents listed in TSD (p. 2128) include *saṃprāpaṇa* and *samudāgama*. The Tibetan seems to be confirmed by the Chinese, rendered as "arriving". The term may be interpreted to mean that *magga* leads to the realization of the levels of the *ariyas*: *sotāpanna* up to *arahat*.

<sup>45</sup> *lhag pa* = *adhi*; *bdag po* = *adhipati* (TSD p. 1198). Sanskrit *ādhipatyā* is usually rendered as *dbañ byed (pa)*, *dbañ (po)*, but there is little doubt that here the text read *ādhipateyya*.

(Translation from the Chinese)<sup>46</sup>

How, through characteristics? (a) Ill is the characteristic of suffering. (b) Origin is the characteristic of cause. (c) Cessation is the characteristic of non-birth. (d) The path is the characteristic of the means of success.<sup>47</sup>

And again, ill is the characteristic of (1) grief, (2) despair, (3) the put together, (4) the limited.<sup>48</sup> Origin is the characteristic of (5) accumulation, (6) cause, condition,<sup>49</sup> (7) fetters, (8) clinging. Cessation is the characteristic of (9) renunciation, (10) solitude, (11) the non-conditioned and (12) the choice. The path is the characteristic of (13) vehicle, (14) arriving, (15) seeing, (16) reliance. Thus should these be known through characteristics.

On the whole the *Vimuttimaggā* version of the 16 natures or characteristics agrees with that of the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, and confirms that the exegesis was early and "pan-Theravādin". The next evidence of the theory is found in the *Visuddhimaggā* (see above), a manual of the 5th-century Mahāvihāravāsins. It is also given in still later texts such as the *Sāratthasamuccaya*, a commentary on the *Catubhāṇavāra* composed probably in Ceylon in the second half of the 12th century, and in the *Paṭhamasambodhi*, a South-east Asian life of the Buddha (date uncertain).<sup>50</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Translation from N.R.M. Ebara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, *The Path of Freedom (Vimuttimaggā)*, [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977, pp. 274,ult-275.7. The translation shows a number of infelicities, and Nos. 4, 12, and 16 are obscure (the numbering is my own).

<sup>47</sup> "means of success" might equal the *thabs* = *upāya* of the Tibetan.

<sup>48</sup> Could the Chinese translate *viparimāṇa* in place of *vipariṇāma*?

<sup>49</sup> I take "cause, condition" to represent one characteristic.

<sup>50</sup> *Sāratthasamuccaya, Atthakathā-bhāṇavāra*, Vol. 4, repr. Bangkok, BE 2532

While the text inscribed on the spokes may be related in part to the 16 senses of the Four Truths, it is impossible to match all of the fragments. [8](3) and (5), *piḷana* and *ādhipateyya*, certainly belong to the group. The *na* of [8](1) might belong to *āyuhana*, *nidāna*, or *niyyāna*. The *samudayasa* of [8](4) and [9](2) might be *samudayassa*, or possibly *samudaya-sacca*. The *sa* of [8](6) might be *samudaya*, *sacca*, or *saññoga*. But there are no counterparts to the *tti* of [8](2) or the *dhi* of [9](1) (unless for some reason *ādhipateyya* was given twice).<sup>51</sup>

2) The complete text of the octagonal pillar fragments may be restored from a set of five verses cited without attribution in two of Buddhaghosa's works, the *Visuddhimagga* and *Sammohavinodanī*, in the *Saddhammapakāsini* of Mahānāma, which probably dates to the early 6th century, and in a *Vinaya-ṭikā*, the *Sāratthadīpanī*, composed in Ceylon during the reign of Parakkamabāhu (12th century).<sup>52</sup> The citation gives one verse for each of the Four Truths in succession, followed by a concluding verse:

[CE 1989], Chap. 21, commentary on the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, p. 53.9 foll.; *Paṭhamasambodhi (Phasabali)*, Bangkok, 2537 [1993], *Dhammacakka-parivatta*, p. 126.8 foll. These references were first noted in G. Coedès, "Une roue de la loi...", p. 226.

<sup>51</sup> For *tti*, we may also consider as candidates *pavatti* (for *dukkha*) or *nivatti* (for *nirodha*): see *Visuddhimagga*, Chap. XVI.23, *pavatti-pavattana-nivatti-nivattana-lakkhaṇāni*. Another possibility is the *\*anuppatti* of the *Vimuttimagga*.

<sup>52</sup> *Visuddhimagga* Chap. XVI.25, (Mm) III 79.13–80.3; *Sammohavinodanī nāma vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā*, (ChS) 80.12–22, (Nāl) 86.18–87.2; *Saddhammapakāsini nāma paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā*, (Mm, BE 2465 [= CE 1922]) I 74.1–11 (for Mahānāma see Warder, "Introduction", p. xlv and Norman, *Pāli Literature*, pp. 132–33); *Sāratthadīpanī nāma vinayaṭṭikā* (Mm) IV 75, ult–76.10. Phrases preserved in the inscription are underlined. For a commentary on the verses see *Paramatthamañjūsāya nāma visuddhi-maggasaṃvaṇṇanāya mahāṭṭikāsammatāya tatiyo bhāgo*, (Mm) 176.6–177.6.

apica

<i>nābādhakam yato dukkham</i>	<i>dukkhā aññaṃ na bādhakam</i>
<i>bādhakattaniyāmena</i>	<i>tato saccam idam matam.</i>
<i>taṃ vinā nāññato dukkham</i>	<i>na hoti na ca taṃ tato</i> <sup>53</sup>
<i>dukkhahetuniyāmena</i>	<i>iti saccam visattikā</i> <sup>54</sup>
<i>nāññā nibbānato santi</i>	<i>santaṃ na ca na taṃ yato</i>
<i>santabhāvanīyāmena</i>	<i>tato saccam idam matam.</i>
<i>maggā aññaṃ na niyyānam</i>	<i>aniyyāno na cāpi so</i>
<i>tacchaniyyānabhāvattā</i> <sup>55</sup>	<i>iti so saccasammato.</i>
<i>iti tacchāvīpallāsa-</i>	<i>bhūtabhāvaṃ catūsvapi</i> <sup>56</sup>
<i>dukkhādīsū visesena</i> <sup>57</sup>	<i>saccatṭham</i> <sup>58</sup> āhu paṇḍitāti.

There is no pain but is affliction,  
And naught that is not pain afflicts:  
This certainty that it afflicts  
Is what is reckoned here as truth.

No other source of pain than craving,  
Nor aught that source provides but pain:

<sup>53</sup> *Visuddhimagga* (Mm) only has *tan tato*.

<sup>54</sup> The word *visattikā* occurs (usually in connection with *taṇhā* and as object of forms of the verb *TṚI*) at *Dhammapada* 180a, 335b; *Suttanipāta* 333c, 768c, 857d; the Sanskrit *viśaktikā* occurs at *Udānavarga* 3:14c, 15a; 15:4f; 16:6c, 8c, 10c; 29:53a, 55a; 30:17d. It is not clear to me how Nānamoli arrived at his rendering of the term as "considered" (see below).

<sup>55</sup> *Saddhammapakāsini* only has here *-bhāvena*.

<sup>56</sup> *catūsvapi Visuddhimagga* (HOS, Mm), *Saddhammapakāsini* (Mm), *Sāratthadīpanī* (Mm); *catusu pi Sammohavinodanī* (ChS), *catusvapi Sammohavinodanī* (Nāl).

<sup>57</sup> So *Visuddhimagga* Mm, *Sāratthadīpanī* Mm: v.l. *dukkhādīsūvisesena* (*Saddhammapakāsini* Mm), *dukkhādīsūvisesena* (*Visuddhimagga* HOS; *Sammohavinodanī* ChS [-ādī-], Nāl).

<sup>58</sup> *Saddhammapakāsini* (Mm) only reads *saccatṭham*.

This certainty in causing pain  
Is why it is considered truth.

There is no peace except nibbāna,  
Nibbāna cannot be but peace:  
This certainty that it is peace  
Is what is reckoned here as truth.

No outlet other than the path,  
Nor fails the path to be the outlet:  
Its status as the very outlet  
Has made it recognised as truth.

This real infallibility,  
Which is their true essential core,  
Is what the wise declare to be  
Truth's meaning common to all four.<sup>59</sup>

Enough of the text is preserved to show that the pillar gave at least the first four verses. The *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th century), the *Sammohavinodanī* and Mahānāma's *Saddhammapakāsinī* (early 6th century) are earlier than the inscription, but since the verse is a citation, it is not certain that any of these is the source of the inscription, which remains unknown.

Texts dealing with the Four Truths are found on other *dhammacakka* inscriptions from the same period (BE 12th–14th

<sup>59</sup> Translation from Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, *The Path of Purification*, Third edition, Kandy, 1975, p. 565 and *The Dispeller of Delusion*, Part I, London, 1987, p. 104.

135/7

centuries).<sup>60</sup> A wheel from Wat Phra Śrī Ratanamahādhātu, Amphoe Muang, Lop Buri was inscribed with the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, as shown by the fragment *udapādi vijjā uda[pādi]*, part of the “refrain” that describes the arising of insight into the Four Truths.<sup>61</sup> The following non-canonical verse was popular:

*sacca kicca kata nāṇaṃ catudhā catudhā kataṃ  
tivaṭṭaṃ dvādasākāraṃ dhammacakkaṃ mahesino.*

Insight into truth, task, and accomplishment  
each performed four times  
make up the three turnings and twelve aspects  
that are the wheel of the dhamma of the Great Sage [the Buddha].

The complete verse is preserved on the base of a *dhammacakka* from Amphoe Kamphaeng Saen, Nakhon Pathom Province<sup>62</sup> and on the hub of a wheel from the same province. Individual spokes of the latter name the “twelve aspects” of the Four Truths.<sup>63</sup> Fragments of the verse are known from octagonal pillar fragments from Sap Champa, Amphoe Chai Badan, Lop Buri; the verse follows the *ye dhammā gāthā* and is followed by several canonical verses.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>60</sup> For a list of *dhammacakkas* see Bauer, Fig. F (p. 50); for a bibliography see Bauer, n. 44 (p. 70). Unless otherwise noted, Bauer dates the inscriptions to the 6th century CE.

<sup>61</sup> Supaphan p. 39; *Charuk* I 123–25; *Charuk boran run raek phop ti lop buri lae klai khiang* (hereafter referred to as *Lop Buri*), Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2524 [1981], pp. 5–6.

<sup>62</sup> Supaphan p. 37; *Charuk* I 98–99.

<sup>63</sup> Supaphan pp. 34–36; *Charuk* I 59–64; Coedès, “Une roue de la loi...”, pp. 221–26.

<sup>64</sup> Supaphan pp. 21–27; *Lop Buri* 28–29, 74–81. Bauer (Fig. F) dates the inscription to the 7th century CE.

The verse summarizes the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*. The “three turnings” (*tivaṭṭa*) are the “insights (*ñāṇa*) into truth (*sacca*), task (*kicca*), and accomplishment (*kata*)” applied to each of the Four Truths (*catudhā catudhā kataṃ*); these constitute the “twelve aspects” (*dvādasākāra*) of insight into the Truths, which are the “wheel of the dhamma” taught by the Great Sage at the Deer Park.<sup>65</sup> As Coedès has pointed out, the verse is found in the *Dhammacakkappavattana* chapter of the *Paṭhamasambodhi*<sup>66</sup> and in the *Sāratthasamuccaya*.<sup>67</sup> As noted by Coedès, the two works are centuries later than the inscriptions, which date to the 6th or 7th centuries: neither can be the source of the verse, which remains unknown.

The four truths are listed in a canonical verse known from an inscribed brick from U Thong (Suphan Buri) and a stone bar from Nakhon Pathom, as well as (in a slightly Sanskritized Pāli) from Andhra Pradesh.<sup>68</sup> A number of votive tablets recently excavated at the important site of Yarang in Southern Thailand, dating to about the 7th century, list

<sup>65</sup> The twelve aspects are imbedded in an unidentified text of homage to the Buddha found on a stone Buddhapāda kept at Wat Chomphuwek, Amphoe Muang, Nonthaburi. The inscription, in the Khom or Khmer script and from a later period (*circa* BE 1800 = CE 1250), ends with the *ye dhammā* verse. See Supaphan pp. 29–33.

<sup>66</sup> George Coedès, “Une roue de la loi...”, p. 226, and “Une vie indochinoise du Buddha”, in *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1968, pp. 225–26. See now *Paṭhamasambodhi (Phasabali)*, Bangkok, 2537 [1993], p. 127.6.

<sup>67</sup> Available to me (as also Coedès) only in the Thai translation, which cites the first three lines of the verse in Pāli: *Sāratthasamuccaya, Atthakathā-bhāṇavāra*, Vol. 4, repr. Bangkok, BE 2532 [CE 1989], Chap. 21, commentary on the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, p. 239.12.

<sup>68</sup> See Part I of the present article.

the four truths, apparently in Sanskrit.<sup>69</sup> At least one wheel from Siam was inscribed with the text of the twelve links of conditioned arising (*paṭicca-samuppāda*), found on the spoke of a wheel from Amphoe Muang, Lop Buri.<sup>70</sup>

The Chai Nat inscriptions add to our knowledge of the textual basis of Dvāravatī Buddhism. The evidence of the canonical extracts in Pāli (including those known from other inscriptions of the period), which agree closely with the Pāli canon as we know it, in conjunction with exegetical terms or phrases found in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* and with verses found in the works of Buddhaghosa and in later texts, prove with certainty that a form of Theravādin Buddhism was current, perhaps predominant, in the Chao Phraya basin during the 6th and 7th centuries.

<sup>69</sup> Kongkaew Weerapajak, “Analysis of the Inscriptions found at Yarang”, *The Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 6, January–February 1990, pp. 35–50; Cha-ame Kaewglai, “Charuk ye dhammā”, *The Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 5, September–October 1993, pp. 72–77.

<sup>70</sup> Supaphan p. 38; *Charuk I* 109–11; *Lop Buri* 7–10.

137/7

## III. A PARITTA INSCRIPTION FROM ŚRIKṢETRA IN BURMA

In his *Historical Sites in Burma*, U Aung Thaw, then Director of Archaeology, referred to "a very recent discovery of a stone slab, unfortunately badly flaked and weathered...made near the Shwedaga Gate [at Śrikṣetra near Prome]. From the fragmentary lines could be read extracts from three popular Pāli recitations in verse, namely, the *Maṅgala Sutta*, the *Ratana Sutta*, and the *Mora Sutta*. It is datable to [the] 6th or 7th century."<sup>1</sup> The same author had already published the text of the inscriptions in an article written in Burmese in 1968.<sup>2</sup> As far as I know, a reproduction has not been published.

According to Aung Thaw's earlier article, the three texts are in fact from two different stones from two different sites.<sup>3</sup> The *Mora-paritta* and *Maṅgala-sutta* are from the stone slab found near the Shwedaga gate. The slab carried about 28 lines of text; the centre is entirely effaced, and the seven fragmentary lines read by Aung Thaw are from the right side. The *Ratana-sutta* is from a stone from Kon Yoe village, north-west of Śrikṣetra. The broken stone carried four lines of

<sup>1</sup> Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites in Burma*, Ministry of Union Culture, [Rangoon], 1972, repr. 1978, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Aung Thaw, "New Light on Pyu Culture", *Union of Burma Journal of Literary and Social Sciences*, Research Development and Co-ordination Committee, Vol. 1, No. 1, Rangoon, January, 1968, pp. 49–59. The brief English summary on p. 261 does not mention the inscriptions. I am grateful to Michael Aung Thwin and May Kyi Win (Northern Illinois University) for copies of the article. The find has been discussed briefly by Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi in his *The Pādaeng Chronicle and the Jengtung State Chronicle Translated*, Ann Arbor, 1981, p. 15, referring (p. 295) to a paper in Burmese entitled "Later Evidence of Pyu Culture", read by U Aung Thaw at the Research Congress of Burma, Rangoon, 24 March 1966 (not seen).

<sup>3</sup> I am grateful to the U.S. Library of Congress office in New Delhi for providing a summary of the relevant paragraphs, through the kind offices of E. Gene Smith.

text. Here I present a romanized version of Aung Thaw's Burmese character transcription, following the author's orthography and division of words and lines, without any changes.<sup>4</sup>

[I. *Mora-paritta*]

- 1.1....pathavippabhāso taṃtaṃ na
- 1.2....apetayaṃ cakkhuma eka
- 1.3....vimuttiyā imāṃso

[II. *Maṅgala-sutta*]

- 2.1....anāthapi
- 2.2....sādevatā bhagavantam gāthāya a
- 2.3....attasammāpa ni dhica etammaṅgala mutamaṃ
- 2.4....jānikammāni etaṃmaṅgalamu

[III. *Ratana-sutta*]

- 3.1. siddhamyaṅkiṃ (khi) dhavāhuramvāsaggesuvā  
yamratanaṃpanitaṃ na...
- 3.2. attitathāgatena idampibuddheratanam  
panitaṃ etena saccena su...tu
- 3.3. yānidha bhūtāni...nibhummanivā  
yānivā antalikke tathāgataṃ
- 3.4. devamanussapūjitaṃ...  
...saṅgham namassāmi

<sup>4</sup>The author does not number the lines. His presentation of the seven lines of the Shwedaga gate slab is clear, but I am uncertain whether my resolution of his text of the Kon Yoe inscription into four lines is correct.

I. *Mora-paritta*

The first fragment is from the *Mora-jātaka*, the ninth text of the *Dalha-vagga* of the *Duka-nipāta* (*Jātaka* II 33–38). The verses of this *jātaka* were transmitted independently as the popular *Mora-paritta*.<sup>5</sup> Line 1.1 of the inscription is from verse 1bc; line 1.2 is from verse 3a; line 1.3 is from verse 4de. The restored text is as follows.<sup>6</sup>

- 1a. [udet' ayaṃ cakkhumā ekarājā]  
 1b. [harissavaṇṇo] (1.1) **pathavippabhāso**  
 1c. **taṃ taṃ na** [massāmi harissavaṇṇaṃ pathavippabhāsaṃ]  
 1d. [tay' ajja guttā viharemu divasaṃ]
- 3a. (1.2) **apet' ayaṃ cakkhum[ā] eka[rājā]**  
 3b. [harissavaṇṇo pathavippabhāso]  
 3c. [taṃ taṃ namassāmi harissavaṇṇaṃ pathavippabhāsaṃ]  
 3d. [tay' ajja guttā viharemu rattiṃ]
- 4a. [ye brāhmaṇā vedagū sabbadhamme]  
 4b. [te me namo te ca maṃ pālayantu]  
 4c. [ nam' atthu buddhānaṃ nam' atthu bodhiyā]  
 4d. [namo vimuttānaṃ namo] (1.3) **vimuttiyā**  
 4e. **imaṃ so** [parittaṃ katvā]  
 4f. [moro vāsam akappayi]

<sup>5</sup> There are some differences in the numbering of the verses in different editions of the *paritta*, depending on whether or not the two introductory verses (not given in the *jātaka* version) are counted. I follow here the numbering in Lionel Lokuliyana, *Catubhānavārapāli, The Text of the Four Recitals, or The Great Book of Protections, Sinhala Maha Pirit Pota*, Colombo, n.d., pp. 34–37.

<sup>6</sup> Restored portions are given in plain type within brackets. Preserved fragments are given in bold type.

II. *Maṅgala-sutta*

The second fragment is from the *Maṅgala-sutta*, the fourth sutta of the *Cūla-vagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta* (Sn pp. 46–47).<sup>7</sup> Lines 2.1 and 2.2 are from the prose introduction (*nidāna*); line 2.3 gives the complete text of verse 3cd, and line 2.4 gives most of verse 6cd. The missing portions may be restored as follows:

*Nidāna*: [ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā sāvatthiyaṃ viharati jetavane] (2.1) **anāthapi**[ṇḍikassa ārāme...ekam antaṃ ṭhitā kho] (2.2) **sā devatā bhagavantaṃ gāthāya a**[jjhabhāsi]...

3ab. [patirūpadesavāso ca pubbe ca katapuññatā]  
 3cd. (2.3) **attasammāpanidhi ca etaṃ maṅgalam utamaṃ(!)**

6ab. [dānañ ca dhammacariyā ca nātakānañ ca saṅgaho]  
 6cd. [anavaj]- (2.4)-**jāni kammāni etaṃ maṅgalam u**[uttamaṃ]

III. *Ratana-sutta*

The third fragment is from the *Ratana-sutta*, the first sutta of the *Cūlavagga* of the *Sutta-nipāta* (Sn pp. 39–42). Lines 3.1–2 give most of verse 3; lines 3.3–4 give most of verse 15abc (or 16abc)<sup>8</sup> and a fragment of line 17d, the last verse. The text may be restored as follows:

<sup>7</sup> I refer here to the numbering of verses in the PTS edition of the *Suttanipāta*.

<sup>8</sup> Since the first three lines of vv. 15 and 16 are the same, the lines might come from either verse. The first three lines of v. 17 are also the same, but I assume from the dotted line in Aung Thaw's text that there is a break with missing text, which rules out v. 17.

(3.1) *siddham*

- 3a. yaṅkiṃ[ci vittaṃ i]dha vā huram vā  
 3b. saggesu vā yaṃ ratanaṃ paṇitaṃ  
 3c. na [no samaṃ] (3.2) att[h]i<sup>9</sup> tathāgatena  
 3d. idaṃ pi buddhe ratanaṃ paṇitaṃ  
 3e. etena saccena su[vatthi ho]tu

- 15a. (3.3) yānidha bhūtāni [samāgatā]ni  
 15b. bhum māni vā yāni vā antalikkhe  
 15c. tathāgataṃ (3.4) devamanussapūjitaṃ  
 15d. [buddhaṃ namassāma suvatthi hotu]

- 17a. [yānidha bhūtāni samāgatāni]  
 17b. [bhum māni vā yāni vā antalikkhe]  
 17c. [tathāgataṃ devamanussapūjitaṃ]  
 17d. (3.4) saṅghaṃ namassāmi(!) [suvatthi hotu]

The inscription seems to give an excerpt from the *Ratana-sutta*, rather than a complete text. The *siddham* at the beginning suggests that the text opened with verse 3 of the *sutta*. From verse 3 the extant text jumps to the end of the *sutta*. In the absence of any plates, or a more scientific description of the stone, it is impossible to say how much of the *sutta* was included in the inscription.

<sup>9</sup> The *atti* of the printed text might be a misprint for *atthi*, the *ta* and the *tha* being similar in Burmese script.

Several other Pāli inscriptions are known from the area.<sup>10</sup> Aung Thaw (*Historical Sites*, p. 32) notes that "these documents by themselves suffice to establish the fact that Theravāda Buddhism was flourishing early at Śrikṣetra".

Nandapuri

Peter Skilling

<sup>10</sup> See Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites*, pp. 31–32; Nihar-Ranjan Ray, "Early Traces of Buddhism in Burma", *The Journal of the Greater India Society*, Vol. VI–1 (January, 1939), pp. 41–49; U Tha Myat, *Pyu Reader*, Rangoon, 1963; and G.H. Luce, "The Advent of Buddhism to Burma", in L. Cousins *et al.* (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht and Boston, 1974, pp. 125–27, cf. also H. Falk in J. Stargardt : *The Oldest Known Pāli Texts*. *JPTS* XXI, 1995, pp. 199–217.

## Sāriputta and his works

Sāriputta was one of the most prominent monks of the Polonnaruva Period:<sup>1</sup> he composed several texts in Pāli, Sanskrit and Sinhala. He was a disciple of Diṃbulāgala Mahākassapa, the first known *saṅgharāja* of Ceylon,<sup>2</sup> and one of the most important members of Parakkamabāhu's great council of *theras*, the date of which is

Abbreviations and the system for citing Pāli sources follow the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Epilegomena to vol. 1, 1948, pp. 5\*-36\*, and vol. 3, 1992, pp. II-VI) and H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990). The only exception being PTS editions, which are cited without edition or date, e.g. Sv-pt = Sv-pt (*Sumāṅgalavilāsinīpurāṇaṭīkā*) Ee 1970 I-III, edited by Lily de Silva.

I would like to thank Prof. R.F. Gombrich, Prof. Oskar von Hinüber and Mr. Royce Wiles, who carefully read this article, for their helpful suggestions and corrections.

<sup>1</sup>PLC, pp. 190-192; O.H. de A. Wijesekera, "Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva Period" in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), pp. 104, 107; S. Saparamadu, "The Sinhalese Language and Literature of the Polonnaruva Period", *ibid.*, p. 120; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādi Buddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), pp. 77-83.

<sup>2</sup>Mhv LXXVIII 6, 16, 57; Saddhamma-s 59, 7; Sās Ne 1961 25, 4; PLC, pp. 176-77; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādi Buddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), pp. 75-77; H. Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), vol. 1, p. 265; S. Jayawardhana, *Handbook of Pali Literature* (Colombo: Karunaratne & Sons Ltd, 1994), pp. 79-80. Cf. Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I, 11-16 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 1, 7-12: *Kassapaṃ taṃ mahātheraṃ saṅghassa parināyakaṃ ... yaṃ nissāya vasanto 'haṃ vuddhipatto 'smi sāsane*. In Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 1, 17-20 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 1, 13-16, another teacher of Sāriputta called Sumedha is also mentioned. Mahākassapa and Sumedha were, according to S. Jayawardhana, "the principal and the vice-principal of the Ālāhana Pariveṇa in Jetavana Vihāra" (Op. cit., p. 144, refers to [A.P. Buddhadatta] *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 249-252, 260-262).



"tentatively fixed at 1165 A.D."<sup>3</sup> Diṃbulāgala Mahākassapa, who was in charge of the reformation of the Buddhist order under the patronage of king Parakkamabāhu I (1153-86),<sup>4</sup> was appointed by the king himself to organise and preside over the great council of *theras* to reform the Buddhist order and establish the Vinaya rules. After the council held under the presidency of Mahākassapa *thera* many *ṭikās* were written,<sup>5</sup> and one of the most important authors was Sāriputta, "perhaps brightest among the constellations that adorned Ceylon's literary firmament during Parākrama-Bāhu's reign."<sup>6</sup> On account of his erudition he was called Sāgaramati,<sup>7</sup> "like the ocean in wisdom", and was "like all the other learned men of his period, a clever Sanskrit scholar as well."<sup>8</sup> Perhaps he was the immediate successor of Mahākassapa as *saṅgharāja* of Ceylon<sup>9</sup> and was very influential with a large circle of disciples such as Vācissara, Sumaṅgala and Dhammakitti, who were famous Pāli authors and

<sup>3</sup>V. Panditha, "Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period" in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), p. 137; see also W. Geiger, "Introduction" in *Mhv Trsl.*, pp. xxviii-xxix; Geiger, § 31, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Saddhamma-s 58, 13-14; Sās Ne 1961 25, 4-5; *Mhv LXXVIII* 6. On the reform of the Buddhist order during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I see also Saddhamma-s 58-59; *Mhv LXXIII* 11-22; *LXXVIII* 1-30; Sās Ne 1961 25, 1-12; PLC, pp. 176-77; W. Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1960), p. 209, § 202; W. Geiger, *Mhv Trsl. (Cūlavamsa)*, vol. 2, p. 102, n. 2; V. Panditha, "Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period" in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), pp. 136-138; H. Bechert, "The Nikāyas of Medieval Sri Lankā and the Unification of the Saṅgha by Parākramabāhu I" in *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A.K. Warder*, Toronto 1993, pp. 11-21.

<sup>5</sup>Saddhamma-s 58, 27 - 60, 24; PLC, pp. 192-194.

<sup>6</sup>PLC, p. 190.

<sup>7</sup>Saddhamma-s 63, 15.

<sup>8</sup>PLC, p. 190.

<sup>9</sup>H. Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), vol. 1, p. 265.

141/7

religious leaders.<sup>10</sup> Sāriputta resided in the Jetavana Vihāra<sup>11</sup> at Polonnaruva in a "vast and glorious *pāsāda* with rooms, terraces and chambers"<sup>12</sup> which the king had specially built for him.

The writing of the *ṭikās* on the canonical texts most probably started very soon after the convocation, because according to Saddhamma-s, it was completed in one year.<sup>13</sup> "The *ṭikās* were sub-commentaries, that is to say, works containing expositions of points in the *Atthakathā* or commentaries which needed further elucidation for correct interpretation; or sometimes they merely gave additional information regarding the discussions in the commentaries, e.g. more illustrative stories."<sup>14</sup> In the chapter where the writing of the *ṭikās* is described Saddhamma-s<sup>15</sup> does not name the authors of the *ṭikās*: "Sāriputta's name is not mentioned, and no special works are assigned to

<sup>10</sup>For a detailed discussion on Sāriputta's disciples and their works see PLC, pp. 198-219 (Sāriputta's Circle); Geiger, §§ 32-34.

<sup>11</sup>Mp-ṭ Be 1961 III 370, 24 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 11 = Pālim Be 1960 468, 12: *sītalūdakasampanne vasam Jetavane imam*. See also Abhidh-s-mhṭ 212, 1-4; *Abhidharmārthasāṅgrahaya Sanna*, ed. by Paññānoli Tissa, 3rd ed. (Ambalangoda: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926, B.E. 2469), p. 257, v. 1; Somadasa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 235.

<sup>12</sup>W. Geiger, *Mhv Trsl. (Cūlavamsa)*, vol. 2, p. 105; *Mhv LXXVIII* 34: *thirasīlassa therassa Sāriputtavhayassa pi, hammiyatthalagabbhehi mahā-pāsādam ujjalam*.

<sup>13</sup>Saddhamma-s 60, 26-28: *ayam piṭakatthakathāya atthavaṇṇanā ekasamvachcharen'eva niṭṭhitā*.

<sup>14</sup>PLC, p. 192. On the etymology of the word *ṭikā* and on the evolution of *ṭikā* literature see Lily de Silva, "General Introduction" in Sv-pt, pp. xxviii-xli; on the methods of exegesis in the sub-commentaries see S. Na Bangchang, "Introduction" in *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭṭikā* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), pp. cxxviii-cxliv. See also K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), pp. 148-51.

<sup>15</sup>Saddhamma-s 58, 27 - 60, 24.

him.”<sup>16</sup> In the next chapter Saddhamma-s gives a list of many authors, among them Sāriputta is mentioned, under the name Sāgaramaṭi, as the author of *Vinayasāṅgaha* (Pālim).<sup>17</sup> According to G.P. Malalasekera “the *ṭikās* may be regarded as the work of a school, rather than of single individuals” and Sāriputta “may possibly have been appointed to supervise certain sections of the work - the *Vinaya*, *Aṅuttara* and *Majjhima* portions.”<sup>18</sup> Whatever the truth may be, Sāriputta is mentioned in the bibliographical texts and in the colophons of the works of his disciples as the author of the following works:

1. *Sāratthadīpanī Vinayaṭikā* (Sp-t)
2. *Aṅuttaranikāyaṭikā, Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā* (Mp-t)
3. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgaha* (Pālim)
4. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgahaṭikā* (Pālim-vn-t)
5. *Pañcikalānkāra*
6. *Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahaya Sanna* (Abhidh-s-sn)

<sup>16</sup>PLC, p. 193.

<sup>17</sup>Saddhamma-s 63, 15-16: *Sāgaramatināmena therena racitaṃ idaṃ, Vinayasāṅgahaṃ nāma vinayatthappakāsaṇaṃ.*

<sup>18</sup>PLC, p. 194; cf. also Geiger § 31. *Majjhimanikāyapurāṇaṭikā, Dutiya Līnatthapakāsini* (Ps-pt) is ascribed to Dhammapāla; for further discussion on the authorship of Ps-pt see S. Na Bangchang, “Introduction” in *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭikā* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), pp. xxiv-xxxix, see also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 47, n. 154. In CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 40\*, 2.2,12, *Majjhimanikāyaṭikā, Dutiya Sāratthamañjūsā* (Ps-t) is ascribed to Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva, but no further evidence is given. According to Saddhamma-s 59, 23-35, the four *ṭikās* with a common name *Sāratthamañjūsā* (Sv-t, Ps-t, Sp-k-t, Mp-t) were written by the “elders” (*therā bhikkhū*) during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153-86). As far as I am aware no research has been done yet on the authorship of *Majjhimanikāyaṭikā, Dutiya Sāratthamañjūsā* (Ps-t).

7. *Visuddhipathasāṅgaha*
8. *Kammaṭṭhānasāṅgaha*
9. *Maṅgalasuttaṭikā*
10. *Sampasādani*
11. *Padāvatāra*.

1. *Sāratthadīpanī Vinayaṭikā* (Sp-t).<sup>19</sup> This is the second *ṭikā* on Buddhaghosa’s *Samantapāsādikā* on *Vinayaṭikā*, written at the request of king Parakkamabāhu I,<sup>20</sup> the first *ṭikā* was written by

<sup>19</sup>Gv 61, 30-31; 71, 10-14; Sās Ne 1961 31, 13; Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1201; *Piṭakat-samuiṇ*<sup>3</sup> (Piṭ-sm) 239; Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe, “Introduction” in *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 1900), p. xv; PLC, p. 192; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 249-252; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Baudhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 78; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 172-173 (§§ 373-374).

Besides the Chatthasaṅgāyana edition (Sp-t Be 1960 I-III) there are four earlier printed editions of Sp-t (Be 1904 I-II, 1910-11 I-IV, 1913 I-IV, 1915-18 I-IV) listed in L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 2, column 946; CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 38\*, 1.2,12 mentions Be 1902-24 I-IV and Ce 1914 ad Sp I 1, 1 - II 516, 17. In *Lankavē puskola pot nāmāvaliya* (LPP), vol. 1, p. 101, s.v. (*Samantapāsādikā Dutiya ṭikā, Dutiya Vinayaṭikā, Sāratthadīpanī, Mahā Sāratthadīpanī*, vol. 2, p. 76, s.v. *Samantapāsādikā Majjhimaṭikā, Vinayamahāṭikā, Mahā Sāratthadīpanī, Sāratthadīpanī* many Mss. of Sp-t are listed; see also V. Fausböll, “Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library” (Formerly part of the King’s Library at Mandalay), *JPTS* (1894-96), pp. 12-13, Mss. 14-16; A. Cabaton, *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits sanscrits et pâlis* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1908), fasc. 2, p. 9, Ms. 45; W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), p. 5, Mss. 14-15.

<sup>20</sup>Sp-t Be 1960 III 496, 6: *ajjesito narindena, so ’haṃ Parakkamabāhunā.*

Vajrabuddhi, who “most likely lived in the late Anurādhapura period,”<sup>21</sup> and is called *Vajrabuddhīkā* (Vjb). In the colophon of *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinīṭikā* (Abhidh-s-mht) written by Sumaṅgala, one of Sāriputta’s disciples,<sup>22</sup> the author praises his teacher and mentions *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-t) as his most important work:

having been supported by the compassion of Sāriputta *thera*, who possesses many virtues most excellent and firm, and whose commentaries on *Vinayaṭṭhakathā* and so on – the foremost among which is *Sāratthadīpanī* – show here the greatness of his knowledge and gladden good people with explanations of the essence of sweet meaning...<sup>23</sup>

A Pagan inscription dated 1442 A.D. (B.E. 804) mentions two *Vinayaṭṭikās*: (1) *īgā pārājikan*, identified by G.H. Luce and Tin Htway<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup>H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 54. According to Lily de Silva (“General Introduction” in Sv-pt, p. xxxviii) Vajrabuddhi lived in the 11th century, but see W.B. Bollée, “Die Stellung der Vinayaṭṭikās in der Pāli-Literatur”, *ZDMG*, Suppl. 1, 17 (1969): pp. 824-835.

<sup>22</sup>PLC, p. 200; Geiger, § 32, 4; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Abhidh-s* and *Abidh-s-mht*, pp. xviii-xix.

<sup>23</sup>Abhidh-s-mht 212, 9-14: *ñāṇānubhāvam iha yassa ca sūcayanti saṃvaṇṇanā ca vinayaṭṭhakathādīkānaṃ Sāratthadīpanimukhā Madhuratthasāra-sandīpanena sujanaṃ paritosayanti. tass’ ānukampam avalambīya Sāriputtatherassa thāmagatasāraguṇākarassa...* (R.F. Gombrich suggests *Sāratthadīpanī*- m.c.; *Madhuratthasāra*- or *madhuratthasāra*- ?). Cf. the colophon of *Abhidharmāthasāraṅgrahaya Sanna* at the end of this article, where the most complete list of Sāriputta’s works is given. See also Somadasa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 235.

<sup>24</sup>G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* (Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976), p. 218, Ms. 9; cf. PLB, p. 102, where the title of the Ms. 9 is mentioned as *Pārājikaṅḍa-ṭikā*.

as “*Pārājika[kanḍa]* sub-commentary *Sāratthadīpanī*”, and (2) *īgā terasakan* which is identified as “[*Samghādisesakanḍa*] Rules sub-commentary”<sup>25</sup> which seems also to be a part of *Sāratthadīpanī*.<sup>26</sup>

## 2. *Āṅuttaranikāyaṭṭikā. Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā* (Mp-t).<sup>27</sup>

In this *ṭikā* six verses of the prologue are nearly identical with six verses

<sup>25</sup>G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as preceding note, p. 219, Ms. 10; cf. PLB, p. 102 where the title of the Ms. 10 is mentioned as *Terasakanḍa-ṭikā*. Piṭ-sm 240 lists *terasakan ṭikā*, and the preceding *ṭikā* - which corresponds to *īgā pārājikan* in the inscription - is mentioned as *Sāratthadīpanī* (Piṭ-sm 239).

<sup>26</sup>Cf. the Ms. in the India Office Library with the title *Terasakan ṭikā pāṭh* which ends with: *ettāvātā ca, Vinaye pāṭavattāya ... Vinayaṭṭhakathāya sā, Sāratthadīpanī nāma sabbaso pariniṭṭhitā ... Terasakanḍavaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā* (see V. Fausböll, “Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library” (Formerly part of the King’s Library at Mandalay), *JPTS* (1894-96), pp. 12-13, Ms. 16).

<sup>27</sup>Gv 61, 32-33; 71, 11-14; Sās Ne 1961 31, 13; Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1201; Piṭ-sm 202-212 (cf. 239); PLC, pp. 192, 194-195; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pāṭisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 260-262; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravāḍī Buddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 78; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), p. 173 (§§ 375-376).

Besides the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* edition (Mp-t Be 1961 I-III) there exist the following three earlier editions of Mp-t: Be 1910 I-II (see CPD, *Epilegomena* to vol. I, p. 41\*, 2.4,12); Ce 1907 (see W.A. de Silva, “A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters”, *JPTS* (1910-12), p. 150; not listed in CPD, *Epilegomena* to vol. I, p. 41\*, 2.4,12); Ce 1930 (see *EncBuddh*, vol. 1, fasc. 4, p. 629, s.v. *Āṅuttara-ṇava-ṭikā*; not listed in CPD, *Epilegomena* to vol. I, p. 41\*, 2.4,12). Mp-t Ce 1907 contains most of *Ekanipāṭaṭṭikā* (cf. Mp-t Be 1961 I 1,1 - 254,17) and Ce 1930 contains the entire *Ekanipāṭaṭṭikā*. The Mss. of Mp-t are listed in: LPP, vol 1, p. 2 (5 Mss. in Sinhala script), vol. 2, p. 1 (7 Mss. in Sinhala script), vol. 3, p. 164 (1 Ms. in Burmese script from the British Museum, Or 2089); W. A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), vol. I, p. 37 (1 Ms. in Sinhala script); Piṭ-sm 202-212 (1 Ms. in Burmese script). For a detailed description of the editions and some of the above mentioned Mss. of

in the prologue of the *Sāratthadīpanī*,<sup>28</sup> the colophons are also very similar<sup>29</sup> and the first few pages of both texts likewise show very few differences.<sup>30</sup> These similarities could be evidence of common authorship.

It is also interesting to note that although the first few pages of Mp-ṭ (and Sp-ṭ) are quite different from the introductory pages of the *purāṇaṭṭhā*s on DN, MN and SN (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt<sup>31</sup>) written Dhammapāla, all the four *nikāyaṭṭhā*s (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) have many parallel passages.<sup>32</sup>

Mp-ṭ see P. Pecenko, "Introduction" in *Āṅguttaraṭṭhā*, *Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā*, vol. 1 (Mp-ṭ Ee (PTS) 1996).

Piṭ-sm 199-201 also lists an incomplete manuscript of the "old" (*hon*<sup>3</sup>) *ṭṭhā* on *Āṅguttaraṅkāya* (Mp-pt, see CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41\*, 2.4, 11), which is, according to Piṭ-sm (1989 edition), at present held in the National Library, Rangoon (note on Piṭ-sm 1 informs us that all the entries which are marked by an asterisk - and Piṭ-sm 199-201 are marked by an asterisk - are held in the National Library, previously Bernard Free Library; see also H. Bechert et al., *Burmese Manuscripts* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), Part 1, p. XXXIV). The manuscript contains only *Eka-*, *Duka-* and *Tikaṅguttaraṭṭhā*. In a letter dated 10 October 1995 Prof. U Ko Lay informs me that "the old *Āṅguttaraṭṭhā*s appear to be out of use in Myanmar monasteries for a long time". Cf. also Oskar von Hinüber, *Op. cit.*, pp. 167 (§ 357), 173 (§ 376).

<sup>28</sup>These are verses 2-7 in the prologue of Mp-ṭ, and verses 4-9 in the prologue of Sp-ṭ, see Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 1, 11-2, 2 and Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 1, 7-2, 2.

<sup>29</sup>The colophons differ only in the first two verses, see Mp-ṭ Be 1961 III 370, 15-371, 8 and Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 2-23.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I 3, 7-5, 14 and Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 18-5, 7.

<sup>31</sup>Sv-pt = *Sumaṅgalavilāsinīpurāṇaṭṭhā*; Ps-pt = *Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭṭhā*; Spk-pt = *Sāratthapakāsinīpurāṇaṭṭhā*.

<sup>32</sup>The introductory portions in these four *ṭṭhā*s are similar because they comment on the introductory verses in Sv 1, 1-2, 9; Ps 1, 1-2, 13; Spk 1, 1-2, 21 and Mp 1, 1-3, 3, which are identical in most cases. Mp-ṭ is nevertheless quite different from the other three *ṭṭhā*s because: 1) it has the introductory verses which the other three *ṭṭhā*s do not have (six verses are the same as in Sp-ṭ, see

*Continues...*

3. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgha* (Pālim).<sup>33</sup> According to G.P. Malalasekera this is purely the work of Sāriputta himself and not the work of an assembly of *ṭṭhā* compilers under the supervision of Sāriputta as is the case with Mp-ṭ and Sp-ṭ.<sup>34</sup> The colophon of Pālim is

above note 28); 2) the prose passage following the verses is much more similar to Sp-ṭ (and Sv-nt) than to the other three *ṭṭhā*s; 3) the *Netti* method applied to the first *sutta* in each of the four *nikāyaṭṭhā*s (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) is much longer in Mp-ṭ. See also "Table of Parallel Passages" in P. Pecenko, *Āṅguttaraṅkāyaṭṭhā*, *Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā: Ganthārambhakathā, Ganthārambhakathāvaṇṇanā, Rūpādivaggavaṇṇanā* (unpublished Ph.D. diss., The Australian National University, 1994), pp. 330-343.

<sup>33</sup>Saddhamma-s 63, 15-16; Gv 61, 31; 71, 10-14; Sās Ne 1961 31, 22; Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1201; Piṭ-sm 260 (cf. 239); Geiger, § 31; de Silva Wickremasinghe, as note 19, p. xv; PLC, pp. 190-192; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 2, pp. 297-298; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādi Buddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 78; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), p. 158 (§§ 334-335).

Besides the Chaṭṭhasāṅghayana edition (Pālim Be 1960) there are three earlier printed editions of Pālim (two Be 1909, Ce 1913) listed in L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pāli and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 2, columns 945-946. The Mss. of Pālim are listed in: V. Fausböll, "Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library" (Formerly part of the King's Library at Mandalay), *JPTS* (1894-96), pp. 117-18, Ms. 30; A. Cabaton, *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits sanscrits et pâlis* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1908), fasc. 2, pp. 52, 80, 152, Mss. 255, 377, 713; W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), pp. 8-9, Mss. 23-25; C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1980), pp. 52-54, Ms. 30; H. Braun et al., *Burmese Manuscripts, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, vol. 23, 2 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985), p. 159, Ms. 340; Somadasa, *Cat.*, vol. 1, pp. 319-320, Ms. Or. 6601(57).

<sup>34</sup>PLC, pp. 194-195.

very similar to the colophons of Sp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ;<sup>35</sup> all three works were written at the request of king Parakkamabāhu I in the Jetavana Vihāra in Polonnaruva. The work has been known under several different titles: *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgaha*, *Vinayasāṅgahaṭṭhakathā*, *Vinayasāṅgaha*, *Vinayasāṅgahapakaraṇa*.<sup>36</sup> In *Laṅkavē puskola pot nāmāvaliya* (LPP) several names for Pālim are also given: *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgaha*, *Pālimuttakaya*, *Pālimuttakavinaya*, *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchaya*, *Mahāvīnayasāṅgaha*, *Vinayasāṅgaha*.<sup>37</sup> *Piṭakatsamuiṅ*<sup>3</sup> (Piṭ-sm) 260 gives it under the name *Vinayasāṅgahaṭṭhakathā*, which seems to be the correct title, since it was “a summary of the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, divided into various sections, giving the explanations of *Vinaya* rules.”<sup>38</sup> On the title page of Pālim Be 1960 the following title is given: “*Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgaho*” *ti pi voharitā Vinayasāṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā*. In the Pagan inscription two Mss. are mentioned:<sup>39</sup> *vineñ saṅgruiw kṛī*, which is identified as *Vinayamahāsāṅgaha*, and *vineñ saṅgruiw ṇay*, identified as *Vinayasāṅgaha*. Similarly Piṭ-sm lists first *Vinayasāṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā*, written by Sāriputta,<sup>40</sup> which obviously corresponds to the “greater” (*kṛī*) *Vinayamahāsāṅgaha* mentioned in the inscription as *vineñ saṅgruiw kṛī*.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Pālim Be 1960 468, 8-21; Mp-ṭ Be 1961 III 370, 15 - 371, 8; Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 496, 2-23.

<sup>36</sup>PLC, p. 191. In Somadasa, Cat (vol. 1, p. 233) it is also mentioned as *Vinayavinicchaya* (Vin-vn) which is a mistake because Vin-vn was written by Buddhadatta; see Vin-vn (Ee 1927), ed. by A.P. Buddhadatta. On the term *pālimuttaka* see Steven Collins, “On the very idea of the Pali canon”, *JPTS* 15 (1990), p. 92.

<sup>37</sup>LPP, vol. 1, p. 58; vol. 2, p. 44 (lists many Mss. of Pālim in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka).

<sup>38</sup>PLC, p. 190.

<sup>39</sup>G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 219, Mss. 11, 12. Cf. PLB, p. 102 where these two texts are called “*Vinayasāṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā* (the greater)” (Ms. 11) and “*Vinayasāṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā* (the less)” (Ms. 12).

<sup>40</sup>Piṭ-sm 260.

Then it mentions two Mss. of *Vinayasāṅgahaṭṭhakathā*,<sup>41</sup> which correspond to the “lesser” (*ṇay*) *Vinayasāṅgaha* mentioned in the inscription as *vineñ saṅgruiw ṇay*. Also among the titles of Pālim given in LPP<sup>42</sup> are *Mahāvīnayasāṅgaha* and *Vinayasāṅgaha*, which seem to correspond to the “greater” (*kṛī*) and the “lesser” (*ṇay*) *Vinayasāṅgaha* listed in the Pagan inscription and in Piṭ-sm. Are these two different texts or just two names for the same text? In the Burmese sources they are mentioned as different but in LPP they are just two names of Pālim. Malalasekera explains this “variety of the titles” as follows:

It has been suggested in view of the variety of the titles under which the book is known that *Vinayasāṅgaha*, or, to give its full name, *Pālimuttaka-Vinayavinicchayasāṅgaha*, was only part of a much larger *Mahā-Vinayasāṅgahapakaraṇa*, but I see no reason to accept this suggestion. It is only too well known that the work of ancient authors often bore more than one title - sometimes confusedly so - and it is quite likely that Sāriputta’s work was no exception to this custom and that whatever its full and original name was, it was generally called the *Vinayasāṅgaha*.<sup>43</sup>

4. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgahaṭṭhikā* (Pālim-vn-ṭ), also *Vinayasāṅgahapurāṇaṭṭhikā*, a *ṭhikā* on *Vinayasāṅgaha* (Pālim), which some sources also ascribe to Sāriputta.<sup>44</sup> According to Malalasekera

<sup>41</sup>Piṭ-sm 261-62. According to Piṭ-sm there are no Mss. of this text available in Burma (see above note 27). Piṭ-sm 262 ascribes it to Cañ’ Kū’ of Ratanapura (Ava); cf. PLC, p. 191.

<sup>42</sup>LPP, vol. 1, p. 58, vol. 2, p. 44.

<sup>43</sup>PLC, p. 191.

<sup>44</sup>Gv 61, 32; 71, 11; Piṭ-sm 291 (cf. 239); de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as note 19, p. xv; PPN, vol. 2, p. 884; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), p. 158 (§§ 336).

146/7

“two *ṭikās* are extant in Ceylon, one old (*purāṇa*) and the other one new (*nava*), but the author and the date of neither is known”.<sup>45</sup> In the colophon of *Abhidharmāthasaṅgrahaya Sanna* (Abhidh-s-sn) it is also mentioned that Sāriputta is the author of both *Vinayaśaṅgaha* and the *ṭikā* on it:

... virtuous *guru*, monk Sāriputta, wrote *Vinayaśaṅgaha* to help those who practice contemplation, and he also composed its commentary on the words which have hidden meaning ...<sup>46</sup>

5. *Pañcīkālankāra*. This is a Sanskrit work, a *ṭikā* on Ratnamati's *Cāndravvyākaraṇaṭīkā*, also called *Cāndrapañcīkā*.<sup>47</sup> This

A Sinhalese printed edition of Pālim-vn-ṭ (Ce 1908 edited by K. Paññāsāra) is listed in L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pāli and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 2, column 946; also CPD, *Epilegomena* to vol. 1, p. 39\*, 1.3.5.1. A Ms. of the *Pālimuttaka Ṭikā* is given in W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), p. 9, Ms. 26; LPP, vol. 1, p. p. 58, s.v. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgahapurāṇaṭīkā*, vol. 2, p. 44, s.v. *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasāṅgahapurāṇaṭīkā, anuttāna-atthadīpanī, anuttānapadavaṇṇanā* lists several Mss. of Pālim-vn-ṭ. There is another *ṭikā* on Pālim written by Tipiṭakālankāra (1578-1651) called *Vinayālankāraṭīkā*, see PLB, p. 54; Geiger § 43; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 2, pp. 298-300; Oskar von Hinüber, *Op. cit.*, p. 158 (§ 337).

<sup>45</sup>PLC, p. 191. These two *ṭikās* on Pālim are most probably Pālim-vn-ṭ, ascribed to Sāriputta, and *Vinayālankāraṭīkā*, written by Tipiṭakālankāra.

<sup>46</sup>Text at the end of this article, vv. 2-3: ....*Sārīsutena yatīnā gurunā guṇena yogīnam upakārāya kato Vinayaśaṅgaho ten' eva racitā c' assa līnatthapadavaṇṇanā*. According to Somadasa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 233, the colophon was written by Sāriputta himself; *līnatthapadavaṇṇanā* in the colophon is read *Līnatthapadavaṇṇanā* (ibid, p. 235) and taken as “*Līnatthapadavaṇṇanā* (on *Papañcasūdanī*)” (ibid, p. 233) which is not correct (see above note 18). Cf. *Dāṭh* VI 2 quoted below.

work seems to be lost.<sup>48</sup> Ratnamati's *Cāndravvyākaraṇaṭīkā* is also mentioned in the Pagan inscription as *Cāndrapañcīkā*: “Word-for-word commentary on Candra's grammar”.<sup>49</sup> Dhammakitti, one of Sāriputta's immediate disciples,<sup>50</sup> mentions in the colophon of his *Dāṭhavaṃsa* (*Dāṭh*), a poem composed in the beginning of 13th century,<sup>51</sup> four of the above mentioned works of Sāriputta:

he who wrote the praised *ṭikā* on the *pañjīkā* to the excellent grammar composed by Candragomin, and a *ṭikā* on the *Vinaya* commentary *Samantapāsādikā*, which produces the power of

<sup>48</sup>Gv 61, 33 (where the *Pañcīkā* is mentioned as one of the five works of Sāriputta); 71, 15-16 (*sakaṭasaddasatthassa Pañcīkā nāma ṭikāgandho attano matiyā Sāriputtācariyena kato*); Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1203 (*Pañcīkāya tu ṭikāpi dhīmatā kavīketunā, therena Sāriputtēna katā parahitathīnā*); Piṭ-sm 1124 (mentions *Cāndrikāpañcīkāṭīkā* written by Sāritānuja, the author of *Sāratthadīpanīṭīkā*; cf. also Piṭ-sm 239); de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as note 19, pp. xiii, xv; PLC, p. 190 (mentions *Ratnamatipañjīkāṭīkā* or *Pañjīkālankāra*); A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Baudhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 78, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; Somadasa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 233; H. Bechert, “Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung”, *StII* 13/14 (1987) [Festschrift W. Rau], pp. 8-10 (mentions Ratnaśrījāna or Ratnamatīpāda, also known as Ratnaśrīpāda, as the author of *Cāndrapañcīkā*, also *Ratnamatīpañjīkā*).

On *Cāndravvyākaraṇaṭīkā* see Th. Oberlies, “Verschiedene neu-entdeckte Texte des Cāndravvyākaraṇa und ihre Verfasser (Studien zum Cāndravvyākaraṇa II)”, *StII* 16 (1992), pp. 164-168, and “Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der Cāndra-Vṛtti zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravvyākaraṇa III)”, *StII* 20 (1996) [Festschrift Paul Thieme], pp. 265-275.

<sup>49</sup>A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 46; H. Bechert, as note 47, p. 10. No Mss. are mentioned in Piṭ-sm 1124 and LPP.

<sup>50</sup>G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 239, Ms. no. 203. Cf. PLB, p. 107, where Ms. 201 is given as *Cāndrapañcīkara [-pañjīkā]*, and p. 107, n. 3.

<sup>51</sup>*Dāṭh* VI 4-6; PLC, p. 195.

<sup>52</sup>Geiger, § 34, 1.

wisdom, wrote a *ṭikā* on the excellent commentary on *Āṅguttaranikāya*, which destroys the restlessness of delusion, and a book called *Vinayaśaṅgaha* for the multitude of those who are self-controlled and are exerting themselves in meditation.<sup>52</sup>

6. *Abhidharmāthasāṅgraha* *Sanne* (Abhidh-s-sn). This is a paraphrase of *Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha* in Sinhala which is ascribed to Sāriputta,<sup>53</sup> who according to Hugh Nevill<sup>54</sup> “calls his own work the *Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha Sīhalatthavaṇṇanā*”. There exist several manuscripts<sup>55</sup> and at least four printed editions<sup>56</sup> of this work.

<sup>52</sup>Dāth VI 1-2: *yo Candragomiracite varasaddasatthe ṭikaṃ pasattham akarittha ca Pañcīkāya buddhippabhāvajaniṇi ca akā Samantapāsādikāya vinayaṭṭhakathāya ṭikaṃ Āṅguttarāgamavaraṭṭhakathāya ṭikaṃ sammohavibbhamavighātakarīṃ akāsi atthāya saṃyamigaṇassa padhānikassa ganthaṃ akā Vinayaśaṅgahanāmadheyyaṃ.*

<sup>53</sup>Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1202; de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as above note 19, p. xv; PLC, p. 192; CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 50\*, 3.8.1, (6): *Abhidharmāthasāṅgrahavistarāsannaya*; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Abhidh-s and Abhidh-s-mht, p. xviii; “Introduction” in Upās, p. 46. Cf. also Piṭ-sm 239.

<sup>54</sup>Descriptive catalogue of the Hugh Nevill collection (HNP), compiled by Hugh Nevill, p. 21, quoted in Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233.

<sup>55</sup>W.A. de Silva, as above note 19, p. 266, Ms. 1743 (*Abhidharmārtha Sangraha Sanne*); Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 233-36, Mss. 6601(1), 6601(2) (*Abhidhammatthasāṅgahapurānasannaya*); LPP, vol. 1, p. 6, s.v. *Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha Sannaya* (many Mss.), vol. 2, p. 5, s.v. *Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha Sannaya*, *Abhidharmārthasāṅgraha Sannaya* (many Mss.).

<sup>56</sup>First edition: Ce 1897, ed. by T. Paññāmolī Tissa with the help of M. Dhammaratana Tissa, Peliyagoḍa (see L.D. Barnett, *A Supplementary Catalogue of the Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books in the Library of the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1906-28), vol. 1, column 42); second edition: Ce 1916, ed. by Paññāmolī Tissa (Ambalamgoḍa: W.E. de Silva and R.C.P. Weerasuriya, Vijaya Printing Press, 1916); third edition: Ce 1926, ed. by Paññāmolī Tissa (Ambalamgoḍa: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926); fourth edition: Ce 1950, ed. by

In the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn<sup>57</sup> Sāriputta is also mentioned as the author of the following four works:<sup>58</sup>

7. *Visuddhipathasāṅgaha*.<sup>59</sup>

8. *Kammaṭṭhānasāṅgaha*.<sup>60</sup> Piṭ-sm lists *Kammaṭṭhānadīpanī* as the work of Sāriputta, and according to Piṭ-sm<sup>61</sup> a manuscript of this work is held in the National Library, Rangoon. It is not clear if this is the same work as *Kammaṭṭhānasāṅgaha* which is listed in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn.

9. *Maṅgalasuttaṭṭikā*.<sup>62</sup> Hoerning<sup>63</sup> lists a Burmese Pāli manuscript of *Maṅgalasuttaṭṭikā* held in the library of the British

Paññāmolī Tissa, (Colombo: 1950) (see Shingyō Yoshimoto, “On the *Sārasāṅgaha*”, *Bukkyō Kenkyū*, vol. XXIV (1995), p. 131).

<sup>57</sup>See text at the end of this article and also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

<sup>58</sup>According to A. P. Buddhadatta and H. Saddhatissa the first three works are not known any more and the fourth work, *Sampasādani*, they do not mention at all; see A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoḍa: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādi Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 78; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 46.

<sup>59</sup>This work seems to be lost; I could not find any further reference.

<sup>60</sup>LPP, vol. 2, p. 14, s.v. *Kammaṭṭhānasāṅgaha*, (also called *Duvidhakammaṭṭhāna?*), lists four Mss. held in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka. Further research is needed here.

<sup>61</sup>Piṭ-sm 364 (see also above note 27).

<sup>62</sup>Cf. text at the end of this article, v. 9: *Maṅgalassa ca suttassa vaṇṇanāya suvaṇṇanā, viññānaṃ likhitā ṭikā bhikkhūnaṃ rativaḍḍhanī*. Hugh Nevill, quoted in Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233, wrongly identifies this work as *Maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanā* (*Maṅgalatthadīpanī*); H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in Upās, p. 46) calls it *Maṅgalasuttasāṅgaha* which seems to be a mistake (cf. v. 9 quoted above).

Museum. If the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn is correct this could be a work of Sāriputta.

10. *Sampasādani*. Perhaps this work is related to *Samapasādaniya Suttanta* of DN.<sup>64</sup> Among the works of unknown authors Gv<sup>65</sup> lists also *Pasādani* and *Pasādajanani*. LPP<sup>66</sup> lists the following Sinhalese works which could be related to *Sampasādani*: *Sampasādaniyasuttapada-ānuma*, *Sampasādaniyasuttavyākya*, *Sampasādaniyasuttasannaya*. From the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn it is not clear in which language the *Sampasādani* was written.

The above four works are mentioned in the colophon of Abhid-s-sn as follows:

*Visuddhipathasaṅgaha* [was written] for the forest-dwelling *bhikkhus*, a collection of the objects of meditation [*Kammaṭṭhānasāṅgaha*] for the *bhikkhus*, who contemplate the objects of meditation ... the precious *Sampasādani* was composed to produce joy for the hearers and for the benefit of the wise ... and a delight-increasing *ṭikā*, which is a thorough

<sup>64</sup>Hoerning, "List of Manuscripts in the British Museum", *JPTS* (1883), p. 140, Ms. 17,554 (6 foll. *ka-kū*). LPP, vol. 3, p. 163, s.v. *Maṅgalasuttaṭṭikā*, wrongly identifies the entire Ms. 17,554 (180 foll.) as *Maṅgalasuttaṭṭikā*; the Ms. contains two texts: *Maṅgalasuttaṭṭikā* (first 6 foll. only) and the first half of *Maṅgalatthadīpanī*. See the unpublished *List of Pali Manuscripts*, [excluding the Nevill Collection (Or. 6599 - 6616)], British Museum, cat. no. B.14. (F.1/f.), London, n.d., p. 8.

<sup>65</sup>DN III 99, 1 - 116, 10.

<sup>66</sup>Gv 62, 34 (*Pasādani*), 72, 19 (*Pasādajanani*). Cf. text at the end of this article, v. 6: *pasādajanatanthāya ... racitā Sampasādani*.

<sup>67</sup>LPP, vol. 1, p. 101; vol. 2, p. 76.

exposition of the commentary on *Maṅgalasutta*, was written for wise *bhikkhus*.<sup>67</sup>

11. *Padāvātāra*. This is the only work which is in many secondary sources ascribed to Sāriputta,<sup>68</sup> but it is not mentioned in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn. This work seems to be lost.<sup>69</sup> In the Pagan inscription a work called (*padāvasāra*) *mahācat* is mentioned and it is identified by G.H. Luce and Tin Htway as: "*Padāvaha mahacakka?* Query *Padāvātāra*, a Sanskrit work on grammar by Sāriputta (PLC 190), or *Sadāvātāra* (cf. [Ms. no.] 165 above)?"<sup>70</sup> Bode also mentions the same work but reads it differently: "*Padāvahāmahācakka* [*Padāvātāra?*]"<sup>71</sup> Sās-dip<sup>72</sup> ascribes the authorship of *Padāvātāra* to Coliyācariya Sāriputtatthera, who according to H. Dhammaratana "lived

<sup>68</sup>See text at the end of this article and cf. Somadasa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 235: *Maṅgalassa [ca] suttassa vaṇṇanāya suvaṇṇanā, viṃṇūnaṃ likhitā ṭikā bhikkhūnaṃ rati vaḍḍhati*.

<sup>69</sup>de Zilva Wickremasinghe, as above note 19, p. xv (refers to the preface to printed edition of the *Moggallāna-pañjikā-pradīpa*); PLC, p. 190 (refers to preface, p. xvi, printed ed. of *Moggallāna-pañjikā-pradīpa*); CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, p. 56\*, (5.3,3 (refers to 5.3,11(2) (= *Maudgalyāyana-pañcikā-pradīpaya*, Ce 1896), p. XV, 27); C.E. Godakumbura, "Introduction" in *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1980), p. xxvii and n. 2. See also H. Bechert, "Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung", *StI* 13/14 (1987) [Festschrift W. Rau], p. 10, note 26.

<sup>70</sup>PLC, p. 190; H. Bechert, as note 68, p. 10;

<sup>71</sup>G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 236, Ms. no. 169.

<sup>72</sup>PLB, p. 106, Ms. 169.

<sup>73</sup>Sās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1244: *Coliyācariyo Sāriputtatthero mahāmati, Padāvātāraṃ dhammāvataranattam akā subhaṃ*. So also H. Bechert, as note 68, p. 10 and note 26 (refers to *Pañcikāpradīpaya*, p. 236); A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādi Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 82 (refers to *Pañcikāpradīpaya*).



at Bodhimangai in Chola country".<sup>73</sup> This is most probably true, since *Padāvatāra* is the only work which is not mentioned in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn, where the most detailed list of Sāriputta's works is given.<sup>74</sup>

According to Hugh Nevill<sup>75</sup> and Somadasa<sup>76</sup> the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn was written by Sāriputta himself. Since the list of works given in the colophon is very detailed this suggestion could be correct. In the colophon of Dāṭh, written in the beginning of the 13th century by Dhammakitti, who was one of Sāriputta's immediate disciples, only four works in the above list are given: Sp-ṭ, Mp-ṭ, Pālim and *Pañcīkālāṅkāra*.<sup>77</sup> The colophon of Abhidh-s-mhṭ written by Sumaṅgala, who was also one of Sāriputta's disciples, mentions only *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-ṭ) as the first work of Sāriputta's "exposition on *Vinayaṭṭhakathā* and so on".<sup>78</sup> It seems that Sp-ṭ, which is mentioned in all three colophons, was considered Sāriputta's "first and foremost work".<sup>79</sup> All three colophons were most probably written not later than the 13th century.

*Saddhammasaṅgaha* (Saddhamma-s), which was written about AD 1400 in Siam,<sup>80</sup> ascribes to Sāriputta only one work, i.e. Pālim.<sup>81</sup> All

<sup>73</sup>H. Dhammaratana Thera, *Buddhism in South India*, The Wheel Publication No. 124/125 (Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1968), p. 41. See also PPN, vol. 2, p. 1118.

<sup>74</sup>See text at the end of this article and also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

<sup>75</sup>Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 233.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 235.

<sup>77</sup>See the discussion on *Pañcīkālāṅkāra* above.

<sup>78</sup>Abhidh-s-mhṭ 212, 13-14: *saṃvaṇṇanā ca vinayaṭṭhakathādīkānaṃ Sāratthadīpanīmukhā*.

<sup>79</sup>H. Saddhatissa, "Introduction" in Upās, p. 47. Cf. PLC, p. 192.

<sup>80</sup>H. Penth, "Reflections on the *Saddhammasaṅgaha*", JSS 65, I (1977), pp. 259-280.

the *ṭikās*, including Sp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ, which are clearly mentioned in the colophons of earlier works (Abhidh-s-sn, Abhidh-s-mhṭ, Dāṭh) as the works of Sāriputta, are in *Saddhamma-s* ascribed to the "elders" (*therā bhikkhū*) or the "great elders" (*mahātherā*),<sup>82</sup> who are also mentioned as "the teachers of the *ṭikās*" (*ṭikācariyā*).<sup>83</sup> Although "it is significant that Sāriputta's name is not mentioned in this connection, and that no special works are assigned to him by the author of *Saddhammasaṅgaha*", there is, according to Malalasekera, "no doubt that the account of the *ṭikā* compilation, as given here [i.e. in *Saddhamma-s*], contains more than a germ of truth".<sup>84</sup> The main aim of the council held during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I and presided over by Diṃbulāgala Mahākassapa was to reconcile different communities of *saṅgha* which "had been torn by various schisms".<sup>85</sup> Although "they accepted the authority of the common canon and of Buddhaghosa's commentaries" they "interpreted various points of teaching in their own way" and "these interpretations were written and handed down in [different] *ṭikās*".<sup>86</sup> The council presided over by Mahākassapa realised the need "[to bring] these various

<sup>81</sup>*Saddhamma-s* 63, 15-16: *Sāgaramatināmena therena racitaṃ idaṃ, Vinayasamgahaṃ nāma vinayaṭṭhappakāsanam*.

<sup>82</sup>*Saddhamma-s* 59, 14 - 61, 30.

<sup>83</sup>*Saddhamma-s* 62, 13.

<sup>84</sup>PLC, p. 193. Cf. H. Saddhatissa, "Introduction" in Upās, p. 47.

<sup>85</sup>PLC, p. 193.

<sup>86</sup>PLC, pp. 193-194. Cf. *Saddhamma-s* 58, 31 - 59, 2: *kattha ci anekesu gaṇṭhipadesu Sihalabhāsāya niruttīyā likhitañ ca kattha ci mūlabhāsāya Māgadhiyā bhāsantarena sammissaṃ ākulañ ca katvā likhitañ ca*; also 61, 10-18. Similarly also Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 5-16. According to Lily de Silva ("General Introduction" in Sv-pt, p. xxxvi) *gaṇṭhipadas* "formed a sort of basis for the compilation of the *ṭikās* during the Poḷonnaruva period, and the *ṭikā* authors openly acclaim their indebtedness to these *gaṇṭhipadas* [see Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 7-8]".

150/7

*ṭikās* together and [make] a synthetic summary of them all".<sup>87</sup> Therefore according to Malalasekera "these *ṭikās* may be regarded as the work of a school, rather than of single individuals",<sup>88</sup> as also the parallel passages found in many other *ṭikās* seem to indicate.

To conclude, I reproduce below the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn,<sup>89</sup> where all the works of Sāriputta except *Padāvātāra* are mentioned:

*ramme Pulatthinagare nagarādhirāje*  
*raññā Parakkamabhujena mahābhujena*  
*kārāpīte vasati Jetavane vihāre*  
*yo rammahammīyavarūpavanābhīrāme* [1]  
*sabbattha patthāyāsena visāradena*  
*suddhāsāyena parisuddhakulodayena*  
*takkāgamādikusalena yatissarena*  
*Sārisutena yatinā gurunā guṇena* [2]  
*yogīnam upakārāya kato Vinayaśaṅgaho*  
*ten' eva racitā c' assa līnatthapadaṅṅaṇā* [3]  
*bhikkhūnaṃ 'raññāvāsīnaṃ Visuddhipathasāṅgaho*  
*kammaṭṭhānikabhikkhūnaṃ kammaṭṭhānassa saṅgaho* [4]  
*Candagomābhīdhānena racitā sādhusammata*  
*pañcīkā ramaṇīyēnā 'lankārena ca bhūsitā* [5]  
*pasādajananatthāya sotūnaṃ ca mahārahā*

<sup>87</sup>PLC, p. 194. According to H. Saddhatissa ("Introduction" in *Upās*, p. 47, n. 154) "the *Linatthappakāsīnī* on Buddhaghosa's commentaries to the four *Nikāyas* written earlier by Dhammapāla might surely have been consulted in this recompilation of *ṭikās*".

<sup>88</sup>PLC, p. 194.

<sup>89</sup>*Abhidharmārthasāṅgrahaya Sanna*, ed. by Paññāmolī Tissa, 3rd ed. (Ambalamgoḍa: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926, B.E. 2469), p. 257; cf. Somadasa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 235. For other editions of Abhidh-s-sn, see n. 56 above.

*viññūnaṃ ca hitatthāya racitā Sampasādani* [6]  
*Vinayaṭṭhakathāyāpi suvisuddhapadakkamā*  
*ṭikā viracitā rammā vinayaññupasaṃsitā* [7]  
*Āṅguttaranikāyayāṭṭhakathāya ca anākulā*  
*bhikkhūnaṃ paṭubhāvāya ṭikā pi ca susaṅkhatā* [8]  
*Maṅgalassa ca suttassa vaṅṅanāya suvaṅṅanā*  
*viññūnaṃ likhitā ṭikā bhikkhūnaṃ rativaddhani*<sup>90</sup> [9]  
*kaṅkhāvīnayanatthāya Abhidhammatthasāṅgahe*  
*bhikkhūnaṃ likhitāṃ ganthāṃ Sīhaḷāya niruttīyā* [10]  
*Parakkamanarindassa narindakulaketuno*<sup>91</sup>  
*nāmena tilakaṃ vuttaṃ nakkhattapathanissitaṃ* [11]  
*yaṃ cāde*<sup>92</sup> *Candabhūtaṃ nisitataramatiṃ Pāṇiniṃ pāṇīniye*  
*sabbasmiṃ takkasatthe paṭutaramatayo katubhūtaṃ va tan*  
*taṃ*  
*maññante Kālidāsaṃ kavījanahadayānandahetuṃ kavīte*  
*sāyaṃ lokatthasiddhiṃ vitaratu racanā tassa Sārisutassa.*  
 [12]<sup>93</sup>

Canberra

Primož Pecenko

<sup>90</sup>Somadassa, *Cat*, vol. 1, p. 235 reads *rati vaḍḍhati*.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., reads *-ketunā*.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., reads *cāde*.

<sup>93</sup>According to A.P. Buddhadatta this verse was written by one of Sāriputta's disciples, see *Theravādi Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 79.

151/7

## The I. B. Horner Lecture 1995 Lexicography, Pali, and Pali lexicography

My official title at Cambridge includes the words Pali Lexicography — a rather general and abstract way to refer to what I am engaged in, which is something much more specific: the writing of a new Pali-English Dictionary for the Pali Text Society. I should like to speak about that dictionary, about what it will be like, what it will aim to do, how it is being written. But I shall speak also about the business of dictionary-writing, and about the history of Pali lexicography in particular.

I would like to begin with a quotation, from a preface — prefaces and quotations, which are part of the stuff of dictionary writing, will feature fairly prominently in my remarks tonight. So, from a preface:

It is the fate of those who toil at the lower employments of life, to be rather driven by the fear of evil than attracted by the prospect of good; to be exposed to censure, without hope of praise; to be disgraced by miscarriage, or punished for neglect, where success would have been without applause, and diligence without reward. Among these unhappy mortals is the writer of dictionaries; whom mankind have considered, not as the pupil, but the slave of science, the pioneer of literature, doomed only to remove rubbish and clear obstructions from the paths of learning and Genius, who press forward to conquest and glory, without bestowing a smile on the humble drudge that facilitates their progress. Every other author may aspire to praise; the lexicographer can

152/7

only hope to escape reproach, and even this negative recompense has been yet granted to very few.

That is the opening of Dr. Johnson's Preface to his Dictionary. I hope you can enjoy the power of his rhetoric and language. I fear that, unless you have ever been a dictionary-writer, you will not appreciate the truth of what he says. Lexicographers inhabit a closed and secret region, unvisited, unknown to others. I have more in common, more fellow-feeling, with other writers of dictionaries than with those who seem nearer to me, such as the denizens of Oriental Faculties, or indeed other Pali scholars, and I shall frequently use the words of three lexicographers, Johnson, Monier-Williams and Stede, to express my own feelings.

If you read the prefaces to dictionaries — although you probably won't: they are usually read only by other lexicographers — but if you were to read the prefaces, you would often find, not the sober statement of the aims of the dictionary, its format, and how best to use it, that you might expect, but a passionate apologia, a piteous cry about the difficulties, the despairs, the unlooked-for but unavoidable delays, the dastardly or dull-witted acts of others — a preface which in rugby parlance is getting its retaliation in first. One aspect of my talk is a kind of preface to the Pali-English Dictionary on which I work, and if you think you hear a note of defensive self-justification, you are probably right.

I have said there will be quotations and prefaces. Another theme will be of evolution and relationship. I am associated with Darwin College, Cambridge, and a Darwinian slant seems appropriate. Lexicography indeed illustrates Natural Selection, or perhaps better the Survival of the Fittest — rather literally, as the work seems to take a heavy toll. Who can forget Dr. Schönberg, described by Monier-Williams in the introduction to his Sanskrit Dictionary?

[He] came to the work in a condition of great physical weakness, and [his] assistance only extended from May 1884 to July 1885, when he left me to die;

or indeed Prof. Goldstücker, commemorated in the same introduction, who

... was singularly unpractical in some of his ideas ... he finished the printing of 480 pages of his own work, which only brought him to the word *arimḍama* ... when an untimely death cut short his lexicographical labours;

but you may not know of Herbert Coleridge, first editor of the New English Dictionary (later the Oxford English Dictionary) who

died in 1861 at the early age of 31, from consumption brought on by a chill caused by sitting in damp clothes during a Philological Society lecture. When he was told that he would not recover he is reported to have exclaimed, "I must begin Sanskrit tomorrow".

His successor as editor-in-chief, Sir James Murray, died in July 1915, after 36 years' work; the last part of the Dictionary appeared in the beginning of 1928. Monier-Williams himself completed the Sanskrit Dictionary only a few days before his death, and did not see it published. And of course, Thomas William Rhys Davids, begetter of the Pali Text Society's first Pali-English Dictionary, died in 1922, three years before the final part of that dictionary was published. I do not say that lexicography is a dangerous pursuit — only that the project is often longer-lived than the writer.

And there is survival of the fittest in another way too: the good dictionary makes others redundant. As in Sanskrit grammar Pāṇini survives, so in Sanskrit lexicography Amarasimha remains the chief name. And he forms part of a chain or tree of development, — not a series in which the succeeding practitioners out-do their predecessors, but where each one makes use of what has gone before, using previous work for a new kind of work. With both arrogance and humility, I set myself at a present point on this line of succession, taking a place in a *paramparā* of workers in words.

Claus Vogel begins his survey of Indian Lexicography with these words:

Lexicographic work started in India at a very early date with the compilation of word-lists (*nighaṇṭu*) giving rare, unexplained, vague, or otherwise difficult terms culled from sacred writings.

Already you can see the line of descent: I spend much of my time with rare, unexplained, vague or otherwise difficult terms culled from sacred writings. Of course the Nighaṇṭu is not like the Pali-English Dictionary, but it does set a pattern for several centuries of Indian lexicography. It begins with three sections of synonyms, the first section giving words for physical things, beginning with earth, the second words for man and qualities associated with man, the third words for abstract qualities; then follows a list of difficult words; and finally a section of the names of deities, beginning with Agni. To the user of a modern dictionary it all seems rather disorganised — the order of words often appears arbitrary, verbal forms occur beside nouns or adjectives — but if we add to it Yāska's Nirukta, of the early centuries BC, we have various elements which will persist. Yāska defines the obscure or difficult words, often giving an etymology or derivation, quoting the Rg-vedic verse and

153/7

adding a commentary to explain or justify his definition; he considers suffixes and particles, describing their sense, their position, their use, noting differences between Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, again supporting his assertions with quotations. One recognises the method. One recognises other things too. His etymologies are usually fanciful; and already there is present a characteristic of many (perhaps all) lexicographers and commentators: often they don't know what the word means. Dr. Johnson, when asked by a lady why he defined 'pastern' — wrongly — as the knee of a horse, replied 'Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance'. Look for example at Nirukta 2:7 foll. where Yāska gives two meanings for the word *nirṛti*, neither of which is that given to it in the Nighaṇṭu. And the Nighaṇṭu and Yāska are like the Pali-English Dictionary in this, that their concern is with a limited and fairly homogeneous body of texts; their function is as a teaching aid in the interpretation of scripture; the definitions and explanations must make sense within the world-view of that scripture, not merely in some abstract and general linguistic sphere.

We have similar material in the Pali Canon itself, although we don't have any lists of words without contexts. But in the Vinaya Piṭaka the important words in a rule are explained or defined. This is definition with a specific and limited purpose: to make clear precisely what the *sikkhāpada* refers to, so that there is no doubt about what is an *āpatti* and what not. It is not quite definition in the way we would expect in a dictionary. See Vin III 23,37 foll.: the rule begins *yo pana bhikkhu ...* and the old commentary has

*yo panā ti yo yādiso yathāyu tto yathājacco yathānāmo  
yathāgotto yathāsīlo yathāvihārī yathāgocarō thero vā  
navo vā majjhimo vā eso vuccati yo panā ti. bhikkhū ti  
bhikkhako ti bhikkhu, bhikkhācariyaṃ ajjhūpagato ti,*

*bhinnaṇaḍḍharo ti bhikkhu ... ehi bhikkhū ti bhikkhu*

...

In this case, various explanations are given, and one is chosen as most appropriate for this particular context. Or see Vin III 189,11:

*upāsikā nāma buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā dhammaṃ  
saraṇaṃ gatā saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā.*

Sometimes the old commentary is closer to that method of synonyms we are familiar with, eg Vin III 46,35:

*ādiyeyyā ti ādiyeyya hareyya avahareyya iriyāpathaṃ  
vikoḍḍeyya ṭhānā cāveyya saṅketaṃ vītināmeyya.*

And already there are grammatical explanations, eg Vin III 73,33:

*ambho purisā ti ālapanavacanā etaṃ.*

The real lexicographical text is the Niddesa, which deals with each word of the Aṭṭhaka and Pārāyaṇa vaggas of the Sutta Nipāta in a way which supplies the place of a dictionary. Practically every word is clarified, either by synonyms, or by what is really a doctrinal exegesis, or by a statement of the word's grammatical form and function. Let us look merely at the first verse of the Kāmasutta:

*kāmaṃ kāmayamānassa tassa ce taṃ samijjhati  
addhā pītimano hoti laddhā macco yad icchati*

The Niddesa tells us there are two types of *kāma* — *vatthukāmā* and *kilesakāmā*. It then explains the two types, giving many examples. Synonyms are given for *kāmayamānassa*, *samijjhati*, *pītimano*, *macco*

and *icchati*. *tassa* is explained as any sort of man or god. *addhā* is defined as an expression for certainty: *ekamsavacanā nissamsayavacanā* etc. *pītimano* is split into *pīti* and *mano*, and synonyms given. For *laddhā* the more familiar form *labhitvā* is given, with more near synonyms. And this is the pattern throughout the Niddesa. It is rather wasteful, as when a word recurs, the same explanation is given in full. But this is of course a text to be memorised. Every repetition both relaxes the effort and reinforces the message.

A comparable practice is followed in the Peṭakopadesa and Nettipakarāṇa, especially in the *vevacana* sections. And in all these texts, the Vinaya, the Niddesa, Peṭakopadesa and Netti, we recognise a primary aim, similar to that we saw in the Nighaṇṭu and Nirukta, first to clarify the words of the Buddha, to specify their acceptation, and then to place those words within the overall teaching, to define not merely what a particular word can mean, but what it means in that context and in the context of the *dhamma* as a whole. And this is an aim I think even an English twentieth century definer of Pali words must keep in mind. I dread being asked what I do, for every word I say requires several sentences of explanation. You may not be quite aware of the depth of *avijjā* about Pali — in the sense both of ignorance and of wrong knowledge — of those who are quite conversant with superconductivity or Pre-Raphaelite painting or even medieval theology. But at some point I say 'Pali is the language of Theravāda Buddhist texts', and though that statement is an attempt to make simple a complicated question, it expresses an important truth. The Nirukta, the *padabhājanīya* sections of the Vinaya, the Pali-English Dictionary, look inward; they aim to tell what a term connotes at a particular time in a particular context, not what it might or could connote in a living, developing language.

The format of word-lists is used by that other survivor in Sanskrit lexicography, Amarasīṃha, of about the seventh or eighth

century of our era, but in his work, *Nāmaṅgānūsāsana*, one is aware of more order. Like the *Nighaṇṭu*, he has sections of synonyms, beginning with heaven and the gods, and including appellations of the Buddha. Then there is a section of homonyms — words with more than one sense, or words of the same form but different meaning; and then a section of indeclinables. And our first Pali dictionary appears to be mainly based on Amarasimha's work. That is the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* by a certain Moggallāna who lived in the Jetavana vihāra in Polonnaruva during the reign and under the patronage of Parakkama Bāhu I, in the twelfth century of our era. The format of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* is very similar to that of the *Amarakośa*: it begins with three sections of synonyms, the first section — *saggakaṇḍa* — dealing with heaven, the gods, the quarters of space, time, mental states, virtues, vices, dancing, musical instruments, objects of the senses, the Vedas, but beginning in this case with the appellations of a Buddha, and of our Buddha, Gotama (the first word is *buddho*), and including expressions for *nibbāna*. It sounds rather chaotic, but in fact there is a sort of logical progression of ideas, enough to help those who had to memorise it, who were also helped by its being in verse, mainly in ślokas. The second section, *bhūkaṇḍa*, deals with earth and countries, with towns and buildings; with men and women, their bodies, their ornaments, their diseases and disabilities, with their class and occupations; with forests and trees and plants, with mountains, with animals, birds and insects; with rivers and seas and lotuses; then we have adjectives, and other nouns which have not already been covered. Moggallāna provides a considerable amount of information: synonyms are given in the nominative case, and where the gender of a word is not clear from its form, the gender is specified, eg by *tthī* or *tthiyam* for a feminine, *napuṃsake* for a neuter, *nitthiyam* if the word can be masculine or neuter. Not all is consistent — remember, it is difficult to write any kind of dictionary, especially in verse. It is not always clear where a subject changes; and there are words to fill a line which can be confusing. Most entries are lists of synonyms, but

sometimes they merely list associated words, for example, after names for Indra we are given the name of Indra's wife, of his elephant, of his chariot etc. And some entries list types of things, eg 147 lists types of perfumes, 148 lists the six categories of tastes.

Moggallāna's next section, like Amarasimha's, is of homonyms. Here the head-word is in the nominative, and the meanings in the locative, sometimes compounded. If the word in different senses differs in gender, then the head-word is repeated with the appropriate termination. The head-word is not always given first, but because it is the only nominative, there is no confusion. And as with the synonyms, gender is marked where there could be ambiguity or misunderstanding, eg 808:

*so bandhave 'ttani ca saṃ so dhanasmim anitthiyam  
sā pume sunakhe vutto 'ttaniye so tilingiko.*

The words are given in descending order of the number of senses, or perhaps, better, according to the length of the verse. The first word — *samaya*, v 778 — has nine meanings in two *anuṣṭubh* lines; but *dāna*, v 1014, has six meanings in one line. Otherwise, there is no obvious method to the ordering of words. Occasionally a word is defined by itself, but only in the Sinhalese edition, not in the Burmese. As often, we wonder: does the Burmese reading give us the original text, or did some Burmese editor recognise the unsatisfactoriness, and 'emend'?

The final section of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* deals with indeclinables — particles, prefixes, adverbs. I am disappointed not to find among the words for 'where?' the form *ko* (Sanskrit *kva*), which is recognised by Buddhaghosa and by Aggavaṃsa in the *Saddaniti* (although Moggallāna does give *kva* itself).

Moggallāna's Abhidhānappadīpikā is based on Amarasimha's work, and perhaps other Sanskrit *kośas*, and he gives Pali words which have not — not yet at any rate — been found in any Pali text, and we might suspect these words are merely Sanskrit words Pali-ised. It may be, rather, that comparatively late texts in Pali, not sufficiently studied by lexicographers, make use of such words, and are Moggallāna's source and justification. For Moggallāna does not slavishly follow Amarasimha — he is compiling a *kośa* for Pali Buddhist texts, with specifically Buddhist words and ideas. For example, as well as that entry including *nibbāna*:

*mokkho nirodho nibbānaṃ dīpo taṇhakkhayo paraṃ  
tāṇaṃ lenaṃ arūpaṃ ca santaṃ saccam anālayaṃ ...*

there are canonical references such as 157, listing the fourfold *virīya*.

The Abhidhānappadīpikā is by no means merely an historical curiosity or indeed merely a guide to 12th century Pali. I think we can assume it reflects a long tradition of understanding and, like Aggavaṃsa's *Saddanīti*, is the product of someone with a wide knowledge of the texts. Both Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa give explanations of difficult or obscure words or passages, which we should take seriously. Often, when they seem to us to make statements contrary to our Sanskrit-trained analysis, or to assign a sense to a word for which we see no etymological justification, they are dealing with a specific case in the texts which they need to interpret in conformity with its Buddhist context, and they may be right in what they say. For example, the Pali-English Dictionary explains *tathāgata* only as an epithet of an *arhat* (it does not actually *define* the word). Abh 93 lists *tathāgata* among words meaning a living being, and 1099 states: *tathāgato jīne satte*. However we explain or derive *tathāgata*, there are passages where it cannot refer

only to the Buddha, and we must accept Moggallāna's testimony — that is what he and the tradition understood, and it makes sense.

Accepting all that, nevertheless Moggallāna is beginning with a Sanskrit model, adapting it to Pali, and adding or changing where the Canon does not fit the model, and this cannot be ultimately satisfactory. A Pali lexicographer now should make use of the Abhidhānappadīpikā and its testimony, but should begin with Pali and the texts, trying to explain what is actually there. As so often, we must find a Middle Way, between the extremes of seeing the Pali Canon as an hermetically sealed, self-sufficient corpus, best explained by itself, without historical or linguistic context, or as a totally dependent system, which, to put it crudely, exhibits a rather perverse misunderstanding of other systems of thought and analysis. Like Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa we must deal with and interpret what is before us, not what might have been; but we are free of some of their limitations and constraints.

The Nighaṇṭu and Yāska, Amarasimha, the Vinaya, Niddesa and Moggallāna — a long connected tradition leads to an Englishman, Robert Caesar Childers, born in 1838, the son of the English chaplain at Nice. In the early 1860s he was in Śrī Laṅkā, first as a writer in the Ceylon Civil Service, then for three years as private secretary to the Governor, Sir Charles McCarthy. He is said to have taken great pains to understand the Sinhalese, studying their language and literature and religion, even, *mirabile dictu*, giving up one of his vacations to study Pali under Yātrāmullē Terunnānse. He himself, however, said that his effort to learn Pali under a native pandit met with indifferent success. In March 1864 his health broke down, and he returned to England, where, after studying with Rost, in 1869 he published in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society the Pali text of the Khuddakapāṭha with a translation and notes. This was the first Pali text printed in England. He then devoted the greater part of his time for the rest of his life to a Pali Dictionary. The



first volume of that dictionary was published in 1872, the second volume in 1875, by which time he was Professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at University College London.

If one reads Childers' preface to his Dictionary, three things, I think, strike one. The first is the absolute confidence of his assertions about Pali and Pali Buddhism, probably none of which we would now accept without reservation. Here is a thought on Pali:

... the softening or breaking up of groups of consonants, the dropping of final consonants, the absence of rigid rules of sandhi, the absence of sounds like *r*, *ṣ* and *au* — all this gives to Pali a softness and flexibility for which we may gladly exchange the stately but harsh regularity of Sanskrit.

I shouldn't imagine I'm alone among students of Pali in not rarely sighing for the regularity of Sanskrit. And on Pali Buddhism:

... the North Buddhist books have no claim to originality, but are partly translations or adaptations of the Pali sacred books, made several centuries after Gotama's time, and partly late outgrowths of Buddhism exhibiting that religion in an extraordinary state of corruption and travesty.

This is hardly politically correct. But this vehemence springs, I feel, from the second striking thing, a very sympathetic trait: his great enthusiasm for Pali and Pali Buddhism. For example, he says:

If the proud boast that the Magadhese [as he considers Pali to be] is the one primeval language fades in the

light of comparative philology, Buddhists may console themselves with the thought that the teaching of Gotama confers upon it a greater lustre than it can derive from any fancied antiquity.

And he compares Pali and the Canon with Dante's Tuscan Italian and the Divine Comedy. The third thing is the very small number of texts to which he apparently had access, or at any rate lists as 'Authorities Quoted': Minayeff's *Prātimokṣasūtra*; his own *Khuddakapāṭha*; Fausbøll's *Dhammapada* of 1855; the same scholar's *Five Jātakas* and *Ten Jātakas*; six suttas of the *Digha Nikāya*, with the commentary to three of them, all in manuscript; Turnour's *Mahāvamsa*; and Trenckner's edition of the first chapter of the *Milindapañha*; and not much else. Except, of course, Moggallāna's *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, edited by Waskaḍuwē Subhūti, with whom Childers was in correspondence, and who supplied him with much information. I think we must also believe that Childers' studies had made him familiar with many more texts than he was able to cite.

I consider Childers' Dictionary an admirable work. It is clear and straightforward, although he gives his articles in the order of the Roman alphabet, which requires concentration on the part of the reader, I find. Compounds are given within the article. He gives a Sanskrit parallel where possible; defines the word; quotes from a text, if available, and translates the quotation. For the more difficult or doctrinal terms he gives an exposition rather than a definition. Compare, if you can, Childers' article on *dhamma*, in three columns, with PED's article (seven and a half columns). Childers begins with a list of definitions, and follows that with quotations illustrating the various senses, translating these quotations so that it is clear how he understands the word in each context. PED seems to me confused in layout and organisation, and overweighted with technical terms from psychology. Or compare the articles on

158/7

*kamma*. Or read his very first article, on the negative prefix *a-*, *an-*. I follow PED in describing the general use of the prefix, and giving examples only in their proper place, but Childers' article with its column of various kinds of examples is illuminating and still to be read with profit.

His article on *nibbāna* is a long essay, and, like all of his articles, is based on the texts and tradition. His evidences and sources are the texts and the practitioners, and seemingly for him, as for me, the main duty of a Pali lexicographer is to define words in a way that makes sense within the texts as we have them, not as we fancy some original meaning might have been, in some imagined original teaching.

Of course Childers' Dictionary is not perfect — how could it be at that stage of knowledge of Pali? There are words and passages he has misunderstood, or where he has followed other writers like Gogerly who had misunderstood. But it is a considerable achievement, and Childers forms an important link in the chain of Pali lexicography. I quote now from the Dictionary of National Biography:

After the completion of the Dictionary Childers with unwearied zeal looked forward to renewed activity. He had announced his intention of publishing a complete translation of the Buddhist Jātaka book ... but a cold contracted in the early part of 1876 developed into a rapid consumption, and he died on 25th July 1876 at the age of 38 ... To an unusually powerful memory and indomitable energy Childers united an enthusiasm in the cause of research, a passionate patience, rare even in new and promising fields.

I like that 'passionate patience'. The writer of that article in the DNB was Thomas William Rhys Davids. He joined the Ceylon Civil Service in 1866 — two years after Childers left — and stayed there for eight years. He also studied Pali with Yātrāmullē Terunnānsē, and, although called to the Bar in 1877, he devoted himself to the study of Pali and Pali Buddhism for the rest of his life. An improved Pali-English Dictionary was always one of his aims. In 1902 he hoped to begin to create this dictionary. As his later collaborator wrote,

It was to be compiled on the basis of the texts issued by the Pali Text Society since its foundation in 1882, and it was conceived on an international plan, according to which some seven or eight famous Sanskrit scholars of Europe should each contribute to the work. Every one of them was enthusiastic about it. In 1903 Rhys Davids announced that the Dictionary would be published in 1905, or at latest in 1906 ... by 1909 only one-eighth of the work had been done. Gradually the co-workers sent back the materials which Rhys Davids had supplied to them. Some had done nothing at all, nor even opened the packets. Only Messrs. Duroiselle and Konow and Mrs. Bode had carried out what they had undertaken to do. After Rhys Davids had again conferred with his colleagues at the Copenhagen Congress in 1908, he published the full scheme of the Dictionary in J.P.T.S. for 1909. Then the War came and stopped the plans for good.

This unreliability of co-workers is another of those themes which run through any account of dictionaries. Monier-Williams seems to have found everybody lacking. He writes:

159/97

Nay, I am constrained to confess that as I advanced further on the path of knowledge, my trustfulness in others ... experienced a series of disagreeable and unexpected shocks; till now ... I find myself left with my faith in the accuracy of human beings generally — and certainly not excepting myself — somewhat distressingly disturbed.

And I have read that the Grimm brothers, in compiling their German Dictionary, had found that out of eighty-three helpers only six were satisfactory, and only one of them ideal.

To return to Rhys Davids: in 1916, when he was already over 70 years old, he decided to launch a provisional dictionary himself, with the help of Dr. William Stede as co-editor. For years he had entered quotations and references in his interleaved copy of Childers' Dictionary, a copy bequeathed to him by Childers himself, and this material was the basis of the new dictionary.

The preface to the Pali-English Dictionary makes it clear that the editors were fully aware of the limitations of their work:

... to wait for perfection would postpone the much-needed dictionary to the Greek kalends. It has therefore been decided to proceed as rapidly as possible with the completion of this first edition, and to reserve the proceeds of the sale for the eventual issue of a second edition which shall come nearer to our ideals of what a Pali Dictionary should be.

That was written in 1921. Again we meet a common theme. Put crudely, do we get it right, or get it out? Sir James Murray was continually

pressed, at times in rather unpleasant terms, by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press to produce more quickly and less carefully. Publish now, and correct in a later edition seemed to be the message. For a Pali-English Dictionary I think the choice is less stark. Perfection is impossible, as complete knowledge of the exact sense of every Pali word is impossible. The compromise is, I think, to impose some limitation on the material, and to accept that some problems are as yet insoluble and move on, leaving a query, in order that one can publish within a reasonable time. But to try to make sure that what one does assert, is as accurate and justifiable as possible.

Rhys Davids' preface is a mild statement; the Apologia appears in Dr. Stede's Afterword. There is much which, *mutatis mutandis*, I could copy as a description of my own case. Listen, for example, to his second paragraph:

When Rhys Davids ... entrusted me with the work, he was still hopeful and optimistic about it, in spite of the failure of the first Dictionary scheme, and thought it would take only a few years to get it done. He seemed to think that the material which was at hand (and the value of which he greatly overrated) could be got ready for press with very little trouble. Alas! it was not so. For it was not merely and not principally a rearrangement and editing of ready material: it was creative and re-creative work from beginning to end, building an intellectual (so to say *manomaya*) edifice on newly-sunk foundations and fitting all the larger and smaller (*khuddakānukhuddakāni*) accessories into their places. This was not to be done in a hurry, nor in a leisurely way. It was a path which led through jungle and thicket, over stones and sticks.

160/7

The style is not mine, but I recognise the problems.

I expect that all here are familiar with the Pali-English Dictionary, and are well aware of its merits and deficiencies. It still seems to me a fairly reliable guide for one beginning to read Pali. For the majority of words, the definition is sufficiently accurate to enable one to understand the text. Some definitions are, as I think, wrong, but that is inevitable. Even had Rhys Davids and Stede had all the material now available, they were bound — as are all lexicographers — to fail to understand or to misunderstand some passages. On detail in PED I am less happy. As it is one of my sources of material I look up all its references. I have been surprised at the inaccuracy of these references, the occasions on which the same citation is given for two different senses of a word, the long lists of citations of an identical expression, without that fact being made clear in the article. One of my favourite misplacements is *sub voce accharā*<sup>2</sup>, Sanskrit *apsaras*, a celestial nymph, where both citations from the Dhammapada atthakathā belong with *accharā*<sup>1</sup>, a snap of the fingers or a pinch. Dh-p-a III 8,22 has the expression *accharam pahari*, which refers to snapping one's fingers as a gesture of dismissal, but could mean 'struck the apsaras'; there are apsaras in the story, but I don't think the therā struck any of them. I also find tedious the large number of unilluminating citations from the commentaries to the Petavatthu and Therīgāthā, which are very unsatisfactory editions — again, perhaps inevitable, as very few commentaries had then been published. I imagine you have learnt to be suspicious of the articles on words which are not common or obvious, and to check, not only the references given, but also Monier-Williams and Edgerton's Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary. It seems to me that Stede is sometimes perverse in his refusal to take Sanskrit as evidence for the meaning of a word. This is another subject on which we should take a Middle Way. I have already stressed that a Pali Dictionary must define in the context of the whole Canon and of Buddhist doctrine, and of course there are

words, not only technical terms, which have a meaning in Pali distinct from the Sanskrit sense — after all, that is exactly the sort of thing Edgerton's Dictionary is concerned with. But equally there are words which make perfectly good sense if identified with a Sanskrit equivalent, without the need to find some special Pali connotation.

I suppose what I don't like about PED will become clear from the ways in which my dictionary differs from it. Perhaps primarily in relation to style or tone. I find some of Stede's assertions, and the didactic tone of the longer articles, somewhat uncomfortable. I hope my tone will be more neutral, that there will be less of the lexicographer and more of the texts.

But perhaps now is the time to say a little about this lexicographer. I have learnt what I know of Pali from two Presidents of the Pali Text Society — only the best for me — first as an undergraduate from Prof. Gombrich, a great enthusiast for the Pali Canon and an inspiring teacher, and then, as a graduate student and collaborator, from Prof. Norman, an equally inspiring teacher with an awesome knowledge of words. And many years ago I wrote PTS invoices for, and drank the coffee of, that previous President whose scholarship and generosity this lecture commemorates. I feel, however, part of the *paramparā* for another reason: the texts of the Canon and the commentaries which I use belonged to Miss Horner, and came to her, some from Lord Chalmers, editor and translator, and some from the library of Prof. and Mrs. Rhys Davids. So I read the actual pages Rhys Davids read. That I account a privilege and pleasure.

I have traced a lexicographic line — a little tendentiously — from the Nighaṇṭu and the Vinaya to myself. I have not mentioned — you may have noticed — a rather important dictionary, the Critical Pali Dictionary of Copenhagen. I don't intend to speak of it at any length,

161/7

partly because I could not do it justice in the confines of this lecture, and partly because, central though it is to Pali studies, it is tangential to my theme, which is mainly of the Pali Text Society and English (or adopted English) scholars. As it were, the branch bifurcates after the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*.

The two motives for CPD were that abandoned International Dictionary scheme of Rhys Davids, and the work of Trenckner. Carl Wilhelm Trenckner (1824 - 1891), a Dane of very wide knowledge in languages, who worked for thirty years teaching Danish and elementary History and Geography in an orphanage, made transcripts of most of the Pali manuscripts in the rich Copenhagen Collection, and of others from London, and had made preparations for a dictionary, in the form of small paper-slips containing words and references, or observations on grammar and syntax, or quotations illustrating secular and daily life. In the Preface to the first fascicle of CPD in 1925 the two editors, Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, briefly relate the history of the dictionary scheme, and the idea that the redaction of the dictionary should take place at Copenhagen where the work as it progressed could constantly be checked by means of Trenckner's material and with the manuscripts of the Rask Collection. After the war had ended hopes of international co-operation, they write:

in 1916, the present editors conceived a plan of editing the dictionary without the aid of foreign co-workers, a task which must of course be calculated to cover at least fifteen years.

Please note that 'fifteen years'. Volume I (words beginning with short *a-*) was brought to a conclusion in 1948. The Dictionary was so to speak re-launched as — and really this time — an international effort in 1958. The first fascicle of Volume II was published in 1960. CPD has

continued to appear, and has now dealt with words beginning *kan-*. After several vicissitudes, its future now looks more secure.

CPD is a giant work. I have not read anywhere a statement of its aims, but it strikes me as committed to completeness. Everything should be examined, discussed, if possible explained, or even corrected. Light should be shone in every musty corner; meanings, shades of meanings, should be hunted down and dissected. I admit I have felt in some fascicles an oppressive weight of material: citation after almost identical citation, with the worthy aim, I think, of illustrating the word from every type and age of text; definitions divided, almost into infinity, in a punctilious attempt to catch every nuance, pin down every metaphorical use; compound after compound, even straightforward *dvandvas*, listed, so that, I suppose, nothing should be unaccounted for. An exhaustive dictionary and, of course, for any serious Pali scholar, indispensable. The first volume, written by two men in whom a wide knowledge of Pali was combined with expertise in philology, in grammar, in Sanskrit and other Indo-Aryan languages in a way rarely seen, is meticulous, scholarly, authoritative, instructive, awe-inspiring. Not all fascicles have reached their standard, but the more recent have regained much of that authority.

I thought it might be interesting to look at examples of my three predecessors — Childers, PED and CPD — before I talk, as the final part of my lecture, of the New Pali-English Dictionary. I mentioned earlier the word *accharā*, a homonym, meaning an *apsaras* or a snap of the fingers. Here are the articles for that second meaning:

Childers: ACCHARĀ (f.) A moment, the snapping of a finger, the twinkling of an eye [*akṣara*]. Ab 66.

You will see that Childers' only reference is to the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*. We must assume that the word did not appear in those *Jātakas* or those

portions of the Dhammapada commentary to which he had access in Fausbøll's editions. The derivation from Sanskrit *akṣara* is presumably merely a guess from the form. Unfortunately, Childers has not found the most common acceptance of the word.

PED: *accharā*<sup>1</sup> (f.) [etym. uncertain, but certainly dialectical; Trenckner connects it with *ācchurita* (Notes 76); Childers compares Sk. *akṣara* (see *akkhara*); there may be a connection with *akkhaṇa* in *akkhaṇavedhin* (cp. BSk. *acchaṭā* Divy 555), or possibly a relation to *ā + tsar*, thus meaning "stealthily", although the primary meaning is "snapping, a quick sound"] the snapping of the fingers, the bringing together of the finger-tips: I. (lit.) *accharan* (sic) *paharati* to snap the fingers J II 447; III 191; IV 124; 126; V 314; VI 366; DhA I 38, 424; — as measure, as much as one may hold with the finger-tips, a pinch J V 385; DhA II 273 (°-*gahaṇamattam*); cp *ekaccharamatta* DhA II 274; — 2. (fig.) a finger's snap, ie a short moment, in *ekaccharakkhaṇe* in one moment Miln 102, and in def. of *acchariya* (qv) at DA I 43; VvA 329.

I tend to think the etymological section - in square brackets - too long and not ultimately helpful. *akṣara* / *akkhara* seems ruled out on grounds of meaning (if you looked up *akkhara* as advised, you would find 'constant, durable, lasting'). *akkhaṇa* is mentioned apparently *only* on grounds of meaning, that it suggests quickness, as sv *akkhaṇavedhin* it is glossed as 'lightning'. The Divyāvadāna reference seems to me to have nothing to do with *akkhaṇavedhin*: someone is woken *acchaṭāśabdena*. Of course I can be smug here; I have the advantage of Edgerton's dictionary article on *acchaṭā*. The definitions are fine, although more information could have been given, as you will see. Two of the references under meaning 1.

162/2

are incorrect. And the commentators' use in their definition of *acchariya* belongs under meaning 1., not 2.; the Vv-a passage is wrongly translated sv *acchariya*.

CPD: '*accharā*, f. (comp. also *acchara*;- *Amg accharā*; *acchaṭā* Vyu 138,42; etymol. unknown; TrPM 76 compared sa. *ācchurita*, n. = *nakhavādyā*, noting v.l. *acchurā*- Thī 67; the *Aṭṭhakathā* derived *acchariya* from this, see *accharāyogga*); 1. a snapping of the fingers (like to sa. *pucchaṭi*, *mukuṭi*, *mucuṭi*), Abh 66; in the phrase *~am paharati*, (a) as signal of command: Ja IV 336,3 (to a peacock); IV 438,5 (to dogs); Ps III 153,6 (to a horse); — (b) expressive of reprimand: Ja II 447,28; IV 124,20; Dh-a I 38,4; III 8,22; 414,6; — (c) do. of dismissal or refuse [sic]: Ja III 191,21; V 314,14; VI 542,7; Dh-a I 424,2; — (d) do. of disregard or contempt: Ps II 524,5; — (e) do. of satisfaction or joy: Ja VI 336,25; — 2. the two or three fingers by which a pinch is taken, *~āya gaṇhitvā* (*gahetvā*), Dh-a III 19,10-14 (cf. *ib.* 18,9: *ūhi aṅgulīhi gahetvā*). Cf. *accharā-gahaṇa*. — 3. a pinch, *~am sakkharāya* (of sugar), Ja V 385,19. — Ifc. v. *ekacchara-kkhaṇa*, *ekacchara-matta*.

The etymology section is more concise, and more sensible. As to the definitions, I'm surprised at the placing of the Abh reference, which is clearly concerned with measures of time, not made clear here. Also the Sanskrit words do not add anything for me; they are all given as lexical in Monier-Williams, so I do not know if or how they are used. So, are they 'like to' *accharā*? My next point is a matter of taste, perhaps. The indication here of the context of the snapping of fingers is welcome, and was missing from PED (even if you looked up all its references, you

183/7

would not find the full range of uses). But I would prefer to illustrate the contexts by quotation, as I do in my dictionary article, and as later parts of CPD do. I will talk about the articles in New PED in greater detail in a few minutes, but first a few words about the dictionary in general.

It would be silly and dishonest to deny any debt to PED. It is of course the basis for my dictionary, a very important source, a *kośa* of scholarship. But I hope what we will produce will be a considerable improvement. I want the New Pali-English Dictionary to be a useful aid, and, as they say, user-friendly. I will tell you how I think it ought to be.

One aspect of the dictionary remains the same: it is to be compiled mainly on the basis of the texts issued by the Pali Text Society. If you compare the list of books consulted at the beginning of PED with a current PTS List of Issues you will see that we now have much more material. There is available to me all of the Canon and its primary commentaries. To that I add a number of later texts like the Mahāvamsa which have been published by the Pali Text Society; and, unlike PED, the Abhidhānappadīpikā, the lists of verbal roots, the Dhātupāṭha and Dhātumañjusā, and Aggavamsa's grammatical work, the Saddaniti. I am able to consult some of the *ṭīkā*s, the sub-commentaries, in a Burmese edition (only the *ṭīkā* to Sumaṅgalavilāsini has been published by the PTS), but I do not think the dictionary has to cover these texts. Exhaustiveness I leave to CPD. Up until recently I found occurrences of words by means of PED and Childers, the Concordance, and the indexes to whatever is indexed. Now I have also a CD-Rom of the Thai edition of the Canon and commentaries, I haven't yet used this, as I need a new computer for it, but it may make the gathering of material easier and more efficient — I hope.

When I began work, in October 1984, I was presented with twenty-six wooden boxes, about eight inches wide by fifteen long, filled

with cards on which had been pasted all the individual entries from PED. (The work of cutting and sticking which must have been involved makes me feel faint.) And I started by checking the references on each card, correcting them if necessary, adding any other pertinent references, and generally tidying up the article. Within a very short time, I realised this would not do. As Monier-Williams said:

In real truth I am bound to confess that I entered upon my ... lexicographical career with a little too magnificent audacity, and a little too airy hopefulness

...

I remind you also of Stede's words:

... it was not merely and not principally a rearrangement and editing of ready material: it was creative and re-creative work from beginning to end ...

It became necessary to use PED merely as one of a number of sources, and to create an entirely new article. In the best of conditions such work takes time. And it is made more time-consuming by the unreliability of the material. I have spoken already of the deficiencies of PED; the deficiencies of some of the editions came as a considerable shock. For several texts I must automatically check every passage in the oriental editions. Not all mistakes can be specifically corrected in the Dictionary — we would require at least another volume — but I hope some obscurities will be removed, some ghostwords laid to rest.

A dictionary article must, as I think, contain a great deal of information expressed as succinctly but as clearly as possible. It has two strands to it: the information I am giving about the word, and my

evidence or justification for that information. The article is made up like this:

1. The form of the word: the stem for a noun or adjective; the full form for an indeclinable; the third person singular (if the present is attested) for a verb; if we have no present, then the form we have.

2. An indication of what sort of word it is: verb, noun, adjective, etc, which also gives the gender. For example, if we look at some dictionary articles:

**kasambu, m. (?)** [cf BHS kaśambakajāta], decomposed or rotten matter; refuse; Abh 224; A IV 172,7 (kāraṇḍavaṃ niddhamatha ~uṃ apakassatha) = Sn 281 (Pj II 311,24 foll.: kasaṭabhūtaṃ ca naṃ khattiyādināṃ majjhe pavitṭhaṃ pabhinnapaggharita-kuṭṭhaṃ caṇḍālaṃ viya apakassatha); — *ifc see anto-*; — °-**jāta, mfn., decomposed; rotten**; Vin II 236,28 (taṃ puggalaṃ dussīlaṃ ... antopūtiṃ avassutaṃ ~aṃ, Be, Ce so; Ee kasambukajātaṃ; Sp 1287,7: ~an ti ākiṇṇadosatāya saṅkiliṭṭhajātaṃ) = Ud 52,16 (Ud-a 297,24: saṅjāta rāgādikacava rattā silavantehi chaddetabbattā ca ~aṃ) ≠ S IV 181,1 (~o); A IV 171,9 (rukkhāni antopūtiṃ avassutāni ~āni); Vism 57,12\* (~o avassuto pāpo); Nidd-a I 338,14 (~o ti saṅkārasabhāvo).

**kasambuka, m. (or mfn.)** [kasambu + ka<sup>2</sup>], rotten matter (or: rotten); — °-**jāta, mfn., decomposed; rotten**; Vin II 236,28 (antopūtiṃ avassutaṃ ~aṃ, Ee so; Be, Ce kasambujātaṃ) ≠ 239,8 (~o, Ee so; Be, Ce kasambujāto).

184/7

**kasā, f.** [S. kaśā, kaṣā], a whip; Abh 370; Vin III 47,6 (~āya vā vettena vā ... haneyyūṃ); M I 87,9 (vividhā kammakāraṇā kārenti ~āhi pi tālenti); Dh 143 (so nindaṃ apabodhati asso bhadro ~ām iva); Th 878 (aṅkusehi ~āhi ca); Sp 998,28 (yo ... ~āhi haññati ayaṃ kasāhato); Mhv 38:82 (tālesi ~āy' ūrūsu so pi taṃ); — *ifc see kaṇṭaka-*; — °**ābhighāta, m., striking with a whip, whipping**; Ud-a 185,7; ...

**kasāva (and kasāya), m.n. and mfn.** [S. BHS kaṣāya; Amg kaṣāya], ...

**akkhāti and akkhāyati<sup>1</sup>, pr. 3 sg.** [S. ākhyāti], declares, announces; tells, tells about; teaches; Vin II 202,5\* (asandiddho ca ~āti);

Thus 'kasambu, m. (?)' tells you *kasambu* is a noun, and is probably masculine, although I can't prove it. 'kasā, f.' is a noun and feminine (and I can prove it, see citations). 'kasāva (and kasāya), m.n. and mfn.' tells you this word appears to have two forms, but *kasāva* is the more usual. It functions as a noun, when it can be masculine or neuter, and also as an adjective. A designation *m(fn)*. would mean that the word is in form adjectival, but is found only in the masculine, probably functioning as a noun. 'akkhāti and akkhāyati<sup>1</sup>, pr. 3 sg.' tells you this is the third person singular of a verb, appearing in two forms, and that *akkhāyati* is a homonym in Pali, being the form also of the third singular of the passive. There follows

3. in square brackets, some explanation of the form of the word, that is, an attempt to place it in a linguistic context. Compared with PED, my statements are very brief, usually merely the parallel word in Sanskrit and/or Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or another Prakrit. If you can remember the article on *accharā* I quoted from PED, you might compare it with mine:



NPED: *accharā*<sup>1</sup>, *f* [*cf* *AMg accharā*, *BHS acchaṭā*;  
*Trenckner (Notes 76) connects with ācchurita*], ...

If there is an equivalent form in Sanskrit, I go no further. Here perhaps by implication I am didactic or demanding. While anyone who wishes simply to read a Buddhist text can go straight to the definition, those who have more interest in Pali itself, or who wish to contribute to a discussion on meaning, should, in my opinion, know Sanskrit, and the Sanskrit parallel should either tell them what they want to know, or send them off to further research in Monier-Williams etc. When an equivalent form or sense is missing in Sanskrit, it may be supplied by Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or, say, by ĀrdhaMāgadhī. If I've found no parallel, then I would hope to give its relation to another word in the Dictionary, which has parallels, or even, as a last resort, suggest an etymology. So, referring to the articles above, for *kasā* we have the Sanskrit *kaśā*, *kaṣā*, straightforward. *kasambu* is more difficult, although there is BHS *kaśambakajāta*. '*cf*' merely warns you that the word is not absolutely parallel: I would expect anyone really interested to consult Edgerton. *kasambuka* is obviously secondary (and is a reading found only in the PTS edition); *kasambu* in square brackets should send you back to the article on *kasambu*. For *kaśāva* I've written [*S.*, *BHS kaśāya*; *AMg kaśāya*]; this suggests that although the form *kaśāya* is found in Sanskrit, a meaning closer to the Pali is found in BHS, and that the usual Prakrit form has *-āya*, *kaśāva* being a specifically Pali development.

The information in square brackets is my first evidence for the meaning of the word.

4. If the declension of the word is irregular, I give the irregular forms. If it is a pronoun, I give the whole declension.

5. Next comes the definition. It may be superfluous to say so, but the definition is the most important, most demanding, and most personal part of the lexicographer's work. Of course some words are straightforward: I did not spend hours puzzling out the best English equivalent for *udaka*. I thought of 'water' quite quickly. But even Dr. Johnson speaks of

the labour of interpreting these words and phrases with brevity, fulness and perspicacity; a task of which the extent and intricacy is sufficiently shewn by the miscarriage of those who have generally attempted it.

And I quote Stede for Pali:

It needs careful and often intricate study to accomplish this task, for even the most skilled and well-read translators have either shirked the most difficult words, or translated them wrongly or with a term which does not and cannot cover the idea adequately. Thus many a crux retarded the work, not to speak of thousands of incorrectnesses in the text of the printed editions.

I hate to criticise a fellow lexicographer, but that 'incorrectnesses' — a word which is indeed in the Complete Oxford English Dictionary, but is rather recherché — sets me on one of my hobby-horses, even at the risk of offence. I believe dictionaries, like translations, should be written in their final form by those to whom the second language, the language translated into, is native. And that only as a very, very last resort (one so far distant that I've not yet come to it) should an English word be manufactured, or a word be chosen because etymologically it bears some relationship to the Pali, when its current connotation, or its definition in an English dictionary, is different.

The definition should be as short and all-embracing as possible. A dictionary definition does not have to contain every feasible English translation — it is not the last word. It is a starting-point for understanding a sentence, a passage, a system of thought. Finding the absolutely right English word in a particular context is the job of the reader or translator. After the definition,

6. the citations, quotations, to justify what I have already said. The choice of quotation is the second most personal part of the work, and the most interesting. I have decided almost always actually to quote passages, not merely cite them, as a bare reference tells you very little. There will be more Pali in my dictionary than in PED or the earlier parts of CPD. For example, to return to *accharā*, where CPD describes the usage, I illustrate with quotations, to show just when people snapped their fingers:

1. *snapping of the fingers* (~am paharati, as a gesture of command; of annoyance, refusal, contempt; also as a gesture of pleasure); Ja II 447,28 (bodhisatto ~am paharivā); IV 124,20 (rājā ~am paharivā nassa vasali ... ti tājjesi); Sv 43,16 (°yoggan ti acchariyam, ~am paharitam yuttan ti attho); Ps II 389,17 (kim tvam ethā ti ~am pahari, so thātam asakkonto tatth'eva antaradhāyi); III 161,8 (daharo ... ~am pahari, asso āgantvā ... bhattam bhunji); Spk I 293,32 (ekā pi gāyi ekā pi nacci ekā pi ~am pahari); Cp-a 213,1 (tvam ito aññattha yāhi ti tassa ~am pahari).

This may reflect my greater liking for language and literature than for words; it also reflects my liking for the great English dictionaries of Johnson and Murray, which are treasure-stores of notable writing in English, teaching meaning by usage and context. I hope my selection

serves several purposes. The passages should confirm or support the definition; in the case of doubtful or unusual words, I would quote a commentary, which may be right and which may be wrong, as Stede says. The passages should show the full spectrum of the senses of the word. They should show the range of texts in which the word is found. Some words occur only in verse texts, some only in the philosophical texts. If the word is found throughout the Canon, I would try to quote from each of several categories of text, such as the Vinaya, the verse texts, the Jātakas, the chronicles, although I would not necessarily quote a common word from the commentaries also. The information is rather negative than positive: for example, if I give no Vinaya reference for a particular word, it means I have not found that word in the Vinaya. The quotations should exemplify various grammatical forms: for example I might try to show two forms of the locative singular, if appropriate. For verbs, I aim to give an example of each tense, especially forms of the aorist, which cannot always be predicted. Thus sv *akkhāti* I list futures and various aorists, as well as the absolutive, passive, past participle and future passive participle. And finally I hope to show by my quotations the usual context of the word, what other ideas it is associated with. Notice sv *kasambu* the several occurrences of *avassuta*. The difficulty in the choosing of quotations is to leave some of them out: there are so many really interesting or quintessential or illuminating sentences in Pali. And as Dr. Johnson in a similar dilemma said, "Some passages I have yet spared, which may relieve the labour of verbal searches, and intersperse with verdure and flowers the dusty deserts of barren philology". For example, sv *akkhāna* we don't need Buddhaghosa's explanation, but it's nice: *akkhānan ti Bhārata-Rāmāyaṇādi* (so in the PTS edition; the Burmese edition has *Bhāratayujjhanādikaṃ*). The article continues with

7. compounds. First in the article there is reference to compounds of which the head-word is the second or final member, and

then a listing of compounds in which the head-word is the first member. As a general rule, only those compounds appear in the dictionary whose meaning is not easily predictable, or one of whose members is not attested as a separate word. This general rule can and must be broken on occasions, otherwise a false view of the language would result. For example, look again at *kasambu*. The compound *kasambujāta* is not difficult to work out; both members appear in the dictionary as separate words, but not to list *kasambujāta* and its occurrences would make *kasambu* seem a much more uncommon word than it is. The article might then end with a reference to another article, eg *akkhāti* refers you also to *ākhyāti*.

What more to say? When will it be finished?

It has been said that the experience of all lexicographers, including Johnson, is that to be certain of a date by which his dictionary will be fairly begun or ended has been the lie in the soul.

The OED was originally planned for ten years but actually took nearly fifty; nor does this include the twenty years before, during which the millions of citations forming the basis of the work were collected.

I will not answer my question. I simply call to witness Monier-Williams, moaner extraordinaire, to attest what a terribly difficult and lonely job it is writing a dictionary:

No-one but those who have taken part in similar labours can at all realize the amount of tedious toil — I might almost say dreary drudgery — involved in the daily routine of small lexicographical details, such as

verifying references and meanings, making indices and lists of words, sorting and sifting an ever-increasing store of materials, revising old work, arranging and re-arranging new, writing and rewriting and interlineating copy, correcting and recorrecting proofs — printed, be it remembered, in five kinds of intricate type, bristling with countless accents and diacritical points, and putting the eyesight, patience and temper ... to severe trial.

But let Dr. Johnson speak for me one last time:

These complaints of difficulty will, by those that have never considered words ... be thought only the jargon of a man willing to magnify his labours ... but every art is obscure to those that have not learned it ... of all the candidates for literary praise, the unhappy lexicographer holds the lowest place ... It appeared that the province allotted me was of all the regions of learning generally confessed to be the least delightful, that it was believed to produce neither fruits nor flowers, and that after a long and laborious cultivation, not even the barren laurel had been found on it. Yet on this province ... I enter'd with the pleasing hope, that as it was low, it likewise would be safe. I was drawn forward with the prospect of employment, which, tho' not splendid, could be useful, and which tho' it could not make my life envied, would keep it innocent, which could awaken no passion, engage me in no contention, nor throw in my way any temptation to disturb the quiet of others by censure, or my own by flattery ... and whatever be the event of my

168/7

34

Margaret Cone

endeavours, I shall not easily regret an attempt which has procured me the honour of appearing thus publicly ... [the Pali Text Society's] most obedient and most humble servant.

Cambridge

Margaret Cone

## Chips from Buddhist Workshops Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand<sup>1</sup>

At the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies in Kunming in 1990 some colophons of old Lān<sup>2</sup>-nā Pāli manuscripts were discussed in a rather general and preliminary way<sup>2</sup>. This survey can and will be supplemented now by more detailed and new information gathered in the meantime first of all while working on a catalogue of the collection of Pāli manuscripts kept at Vat Lai Hin near Lampang. This collection is among the most remarkable ones by any standard anywhere in respect of both age and quality of the manuscripts, the oldest dated of which was copied in CS 833 : A.D. 1471. Today about 140 Pāli manuscripts are found in this collection, and quite a few fragments or single folios are sad witnesses of the former existence of many, sometimes fairly old, manuscripts, for originally this collection must have been substantially larger and richer. This is not only proved by these fragments, but also by those manuscripts which have found their way from Vat Lai Hin into other libraries under unknown circumstances. Some are with the Siam Society, Bangkok<sup>3</sup>, and at least one is today in the National Library, Bangkok: no. 303/5, *tī*<sup>2</sup> 129, *ja* 82/5: Samantapāsādikā, fasc. 5, which is one of the missing fascicles of Siam Society no. 54, as proved by identical measures and identical colophons. Otherwise the holdings of older northern Pāli manuscripts in the National Library are negligible as

<sup>1</sup> Manuscripts are quoted either in referring to the forthcoming catalogue: Die Pāli Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand" or to the microfilms of the "Preservation of Northern Thai Manuscripts Project" (PNTMP). – The letter ø is used for the "o ang".

<sup>2</sup> O. v.Hinüber: On some colophons of old Lānā Pāli manuscripts, in: Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies. 11-13th May 1990. Kunming 1990, Vol. IV, p.56-77.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. O. v.Hinüber: The Pāli manuscripts kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A Short Catalogue. JSS 75.1987, p.9-74.